

Also, a bill (H. R. 14834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waupaca, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wausau, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marshfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wautoma, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Washington, Iowa, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 14839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Columbia, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Elizabethtown, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Christiana, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14842) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 14843) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Danville, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14844) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Henry, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14845) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Franklin, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14846) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Halifax, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14847) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Muhlenberg, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 511) for the consideration of House bill 13026; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 394) to provide for the marking of the positions held by the American Expeditionary Forces in Europe during this war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, requesting that the name of the Panama Canal be changed to the Roosevelt Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, favoring the submission of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States giving woman the elective franchise; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 14848) granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 14849) granting an increase of pension to Amos Langfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 14850) for the relief of John Healy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14851) granting an increase of pension to Darwin H. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Resolutions by Oregon State Reconstruction Convention, Portland, Oreg., relative to allowance and transportation, etc., of discharged sailors and soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Mrs. L. B. Kimberly, Mrs. S. S. Ryan, Mrs. Baumgartner, Mrs. James J. Schmitt, of Erie, Pa., asking for repeal of postal-zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Erie, Pa., for repeal of postal-zone bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions by Unit Lodge of Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel, and Tin Workers, of Cleveland, Ohio, in favor of eight-hour law; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolutions by Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron-ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Omaha, Nebr., favoring Government ownership of railroads for a period of five years; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Omaha Post Office Clerks' Union, Local No. 134, in support of House bill 13308; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of theaters of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against 20 per cent ticket war tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Resolutions by citizens of Meriden, Conn., urging the return to the United States of the Twenty-fifth Division of the American Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of the Harris Amusement Cos., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against the increase of tax on amusements, thus crippling the business and entailing an unjust burden on patrons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POLK: Resolutions of Wilmington (Del.) Jovians, favoring Federal control of wire system, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDALL: Resolution of Ebell Club, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage of Smith-Bankhead bill, retaining men crippled in industry equally with men crippled in war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of Mrs. Minnie W. Hines, postmaster at Roosevelt, Minn., urging increase of compensation for fourth-class postmasters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 22, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, January 20, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Chamberlain	King	Nugent	Spencer
Cole	Kirby	Overman	Sterling
Culberson	Knox	Page	Thomas
Cummins	La Follette	Penrose	Thompson
Curtis	Lenroot	Pittman	Townsend
France	Lodge	Polindexter	Trammell
Gay	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Hale	McKellar	Shafroth	Warren
Harding	McLean	Sheppard	Watson
Henderson	McNary	Sherman	Weeks
Hollis	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott

Mr. SAULSBURY. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] is unable to be present at the session of the Senate to-day and will not be for a few days hereafter because of a serious accident.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SUTHERLAND] on account of illness in his family. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

I wish also to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] on official business of the Senate.

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on account of illness.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] owing to illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Missouri

[Mr. REED], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12001) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WEBB, Mr. CARLIN, Mr. STEELE, Mr. VOLSTEAD, and Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House insists upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigation, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel, and in producing commercial products, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FOSTER, Mr. WINGO, and Mr. DENISON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 11948) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a bridge across Pearl River at or near the north line of section 22 of the basis meridian, in the land district east of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club, of Red Lake Falls, Minn., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. COLT presented a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, favoring the granting of additional pay to discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LODGE presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Springfield, Mass., favoring the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ALLOTMENTS OF ENLISTED MEN.

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 655) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 5404) providing for the conveyance to the State of Montana of Fort William Henry Harrison Military Reservation for educational and other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5405) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Harrison, Me., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5406) for the relief of Frank Vumbaca; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 5407) granting an increase of pension to Levi M. Starne (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 5408) granting an increase of pension to Matthias V. Bridges (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5409) granting an increase of pension to M. Cecelia Allen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 5410) granting an increase of pension to Dallas Thurman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 5411) granting a pension to Catharine Derstine (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 216) looking to the construction of ships for foreign governments or corporations in the shipyards of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

FOOD SUPPLIES FOR EUROPE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ASHURST. I offer the following amendment to add a new section, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

That every soldier, sailor, and marine in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, upon receiving an honorable discharge shall be entitled to keep and retain as his own property the uniform, overcoat, and other articles of apparel he is wearing at the time of such discharge from the service, and no charge or debit whatever shall be entered against the account of any such discharged soldier or sailor or marine by reason of his retaining said uniform, overcoat, and other articles of apparel. And there shall be paid to every such soldier, sailor, and marine full pay for the 90 days next ensuing after the date of his honorable discharge.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Arizona whether this is to apply only to soldiers who are discharged after the passage of the bill or to what soldiers and sailors does the privilege extend?

Mr. ASHURST. It is impossible to hear the Senator's questions, there is so much confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. KNOX. I want to know whether this applies only to soldiers and sailors who are to be discharged after the passage of the bill or whether—

Mr. ASHURST. I may not have been very happy in the use of language, but it was the intention of the amendment that it should apply to all honorably discharged soldiers of the war with Germany, and I thank the Senator for calling attention to it. I think the amendment is lame in that respect, and I would welcome an amendment from the Senator making it certain, so that there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. KNOX. The Senator from Arizona can perfect his amendment to cover the idea if he approves of it. I think all should be included.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There was a bill of that kind which passed the House some days ago and came to the Senate, and it was passed in the Senate with some amendments. I think it covers the very situation proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. I think it may lead to confusion if we undertake to add the amendment at this time.

Mr. ASHURST. I think the Senator's observation is correct. Therefore I further modify my amendment by striking out that part of the amendment which relates to uniforms and other articles of apparel. I ask leave to modify the amendment so as to add a new section, as follows:

There shall be paid to every soldier, sailor, and marine in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, upon his receiving an honorable discharge, full pay for the 90 days next ensuing after the date of his honorable discharge, which said sum of money shall be paid to him without regard to whether he was discharged before or subsequent to the signing of the armistice.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There was a provision added to the very bill to which I have just referred allowing the men one month's pay. The Senator's amendment differs from that in that he proposes to give them three months' pay.

Mr. ASHURST. Three months' pay.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There has been a bill already passed by the Senate for one month's pay.

Mr. ASHURST. There was, it is true, an amendment adopted on the revenue bill providing for one month's pay; but I apprehend that it will be some time before the conferees agree on the revenue bill. Moreover, while one month's extra pay was

proper, I feel persuaded, as I said the other day, in view of the fact that this \$100,000,000 is a gift, a bounty, a charity, and I gladly support it, it is going to feed persons who if they come here will come to destroy, not enjoy, our institutions. It is going to men who know nothing, and most of them care less, about civil liberty as we understand it on this continent.

But, as I said the other day, better no charity than that grudgingly given, and so I am going to vote for the appropriation of \$100,000,000.

Pardon me for a moment while I repeat what I said the other day. It is doubtful whether we have a right to use public funds for charity, but charity is so sweet, so gentle, and so merciful an attribute that we can not refuse to dispense any charity, especially when it is the other fellow's money that we are giving out.

But, as I said the other day, justice not charity builds government. You can not build governments on mercy and charity. It is justice that makes one love his country.

These young American soldiers of the great war were touched by the mysterious finger of duty. They left their gainful occupations. Many of them will have the currents of their entire lives diverted and changed.

I apprehend that probably 40 or 50 per cent of these soldiers do not at all need this \$90 which would be paid to them, but there are many of them who will appreciate it and who can make immediate use of it in obtaining for themselves another position or in reassuring their old positions and putting themselves back again into the activities in civil life they once exercised. Had these young American soldiers not stepped into the breach and hurled back the Huns and saved us from the atrocity of the Bulgar, the Magyar, and the Turk we would have had no charity to dispense. We would have had no law and order and no civil liberty.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield, but I was going to yield the floor in a moment.

Mr. BORAH. I will wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. ASHURST. I am glad to yield now.

Mr. BORAH. I was only going to say that I agree with the Senator from Arizona as to the attributes of charity, but I think with the Senator from Arizona also that as to this particular charity the amendment which he now offers helps to make it palatable.

Mr. ASHURST. I do not know what construction my friend places on my remarks. I said twice I regard this appropriation of \$100,000,000 as a charity that is going to starving men, men whose indolence and neglect have lost a large amount of the world's supply of food.

Mr. BORAH. I do not disagree with the Senator. I say, then, the Senator regards it as a charity and also regards it as essential to sugar-coat the charity by this amendment.

Mr. ASHURST. If I can sugar-coat a nauseous pill, which pill is good for the physical body, I shall certainly sugar-coat it. I appreciate the humor of the able Senator. I repeat these young soldiers left civil life. They are going to be demobilized. It was wise and proper that they should have their uniforms. The amendment giving them their uniforms is not original with me. That was introduced by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] two or three months ago. It is a worthy amendment, and I am glad it has passed both Houses of Congress. But I do insist, and I feel very earnest about it, that if we can afford, in view of the enormous drains upon our Federal Treasury, to give charity to those who do not understand our Government, do not appreciate it, and do not love it, surely we can do some need and measure of justice to those American soldiers who have been taken out of civil life and have saved our civilization.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I will yield to the Senator. I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to take any part in this debate, for if the pending bill is to be passed at all, it should be passed as soon as possible. I have not yet determined whether I shall vote for or against it, because I have serious misgivings both as to the justice and the validity of our proposed action; but I can not allow an amendment of this sort to reach a vote without recording my protest against it. It is, in my judgment, the first of a series of measures designed to transform our splendid Army into a huge band of mercenaries, and to define their ideals of duty and patriotism by standards of monetary compensation. It is the introduction of a sinister feature into legislation as one of the aftermaths of this war, the fruits of which will be bitter, if, indeed, they do not ultimately spell financial ruin.

Mr. President, I yield to no man in my devotion to the American soldier, in my recognition of his magnificent performance of his duty, in the breadth and depth of his sacrifice, in the

debt which civilization owes to him for its preservation; but I will not believe that an American Army every fought for a money compensation. If so, then duty becomes a sordid subject of financial reward and not of right or of conscience.

Mr. President, if it be true that because of the sacrifices which the soldiers at the front have made for the salvation of our institutions, we should place our hands in the Public Treasury, now almost empty, and take from it \$350,000,000 and distribute it among them whether they need it or not—and the Senator says that a great many of them do not need it—why should we not recognize that principle of justice which the Senator invokes for his amendment and reward others who are equally entitled to consideration?

This war, Mr. President, was not fought in the trenches or at the front only. It was fought in this country; it was fought by every man manufacturing munitions; by every man in the shipyards; by every individual engaged in the performance of public service in the city of Washington; by every farmer sowing grain; by every planter raising cotton; by every woodgrower tending his herds and flocks; by every stock raiser increasing his herds; in other words, by every woman and every child engaged in the great work of winning this war in whatever capacity. This was a war not between armies, but between nations. It consisted of the mobilization not of men alone, but of material, of women and children; of the man behind the front as well as the man at the front.

Justice is said to be even-handed, and nothing is justice which is unequal in its operation. Why not, when these people at home have done all these things, give them each a suit of clothes plus \$90? Instead of stopping at \$350,000,000, why not do this thing by wholesale and devote \$3,500,000,000 to this work of representing justice and paying men and women for the performance of their duty.

Mr. President, after all, this money is at our disposal. We can squander it if we will, but it comes from the taxpayer, who also has had something to do with the winning of this war. He labored harder than ever and the burden of his public contributions was multiplied many fold. In its last analysis, with a few exceptions, it falls upon the backs of the producer and the consumer.

Mr. President, if this country has been preserved only to enable us to pass on huge quantities of our revenues obtained by taxes to the soldiers, if we are to bankrupt what war has secured, I have some question whether it was worth saving.

I dread, Mr. President, to contemplate the effect upon the morale in civil life of this proposed congressional policy, which recognizes and establishes a money standard for public service. I by no means would oppose, on the contrary, I would advocate, and do advocate, that this Government care for every man who has, through disease or wounds, been so incapacitated for self-support and for the support of his family, the extremes of liberality; that is an obligation we owe. I want to see the Government exercise itself, as far as it can consistently do, to secure such employment for these men when they come home, but I do not want to look these boys in the face and say, "You have done well; what shall be the size of your tip? Uncle Sam has millions of money and expects to raise millions more; we will pay you in accordance with what you think the measure of your duty commands."

Mr. President, we hear of profiteers in this country and some patrioteers. If this amendment carries we shall soon have an army of pensioners—a greater army of pensioners than we ever had before. We may begin this practice of voluntarily giving these enormous sums of money to returning soldiers, but the time is not far distant when they will demand other sums as a right and not as a bestowal of congressional bounty. I do not believe in it.

I am appalled, Mr. President, at the enormous sums which are represented by bill after bill introduced into this Congress appropriating untold treasures for this, that, and the other object. A million dollars used to be a fair average for special appropriation bills. Then it became ten millions, and now it is a hundred millions. A bill was introduced yesterday, I believe, appropriating \$100,000,000 for a very desirable object the Secretary of the Interior recommends. The pending bill calls for the appropriation of \$100,000,000. And the Senator from Iowa wants another \$100,000,000 for employment bureaus.

Mr. President, where are these funds coming from? We are extremely generous and liberal with other people's money; we pay our political debts with public money. We yield to the persuasions, the entreaties, and the threats of our constituents who want money out of the Public Treasury for unnumbered projects, and we give it to them. How long will this thing continue? There is great unrest in the country. Every scheme which can not finance itself comes to the Treasury and finds advocates

either at the other end of the Capitol or here, or both, and inasmuch as under our system of legislation a bill, regardless of its title, may contain legislation of any sort whatever, we load bills down with riders carrying appropriations for objects which are utterly foreign to the mind of the Senator or the Representative who drafted the original bill.

I do not want to see this policy of voting money to soldiers begun, but if it shall be, let us not confine our liberality with the public money to the man who wears the uniform. Let us give it to every man, woman, and child in the country who has served the Nation in its time of need. When you apply this policy of legislation to the present Army, I want to warn the Senate and the public that no man can foresee what the end of it will be. It will increase in mathematical progression as time goes on and taxes will increase correspondingly. While the taxpayer has been quiescent, marvelously quiescent, paralyzed, it would seem by his inaction, you will hear from him sooner or later; he will have enough of it before he lives very much longer; and when he rouses himself I predict that those who have been most liberal with the Public Treasury will be the first to announce their change of heart and seek atonement by insisting upon a frugality so rigidly economical as to arrest the machinery of administration. I trust, Mr. President, that this and all similar bills and amendments will be defeated, in the Senate, at least.

A Senator near me asks the pertinent question, "Have these boys asked for this gratuity?" I do not believe they have. I believe that the young American boy at the front, native and naturalized, feels ample compensation in the consciousness of duty performed in the maintenance of American standards and the contribution of his part to the salvation of his country's institutions.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I indorse much of what has been said by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], and I am opposed to this and to all other amendments to this bill. The government that adopts a system of procedure that will cause the individual citizen to lose his initiative and depend upon the Government for support and assistance rather than to rely upon himself has done its citizen a great injury, and when it has caused that sort of an opinion to prevail amongst all its citizens it has done itself an injury that ultimately will result in destruction. This is not the time or place, however, to settle our soldiers' compensation, and no Senator here is disposed to be more liberal to them than am I.

But without regard to that, the time has come, it seems to me, when we should proceed about this matter as it ought to be proceeded with. We have finished this war so far as the fighting is concerned, we understand, but the most important part of it still remains to be done; we must settle the matter finally and for the future, for our own and the world's benefit.

Our representative is yonder, in the greatest world's conference of all the ages. Our representative has committed us to this policy; he has said it will improve conditions to such an extent that we may bring about a successful termination of the conference, and that we may procure what ought to be obtained for the United States of America and for the world; that it will conduce and contribute to that end greatly. We have been committed to this policy by the President of the United States of America, the representative of this body and the Nation and of our entire people in the world's peace conference, and it seems to me the time has come when we should treat it upon that broad ground. If we do not propose to support this measure, then vote it down as a whole, but do not tie other amendments on to it. Let it be an expression of the Congress of the United States as to whether we will back up our representative and strengthen and extend his influence in the peace conference, as he has suggested should be done, in order to bring about a successful termination and ending of the war for us and for the world.

We are there insisting upon certain things for the benefit of the nations of the world. We fought this war for the freedom of the seas. Our declaration of war shows that; our entire policy shows it. We have fought other wars for the freedom of the seas, and we will fight yet other wars hereafter, if necessary, for the freedom of the seas for the United States of America if the principle is not properly recognized, adjusted, and concluded by the peace conference now in session in the Old World. That is what we have been insisting upon. Now we are there to finish the negotiations and conclude the matter. It has been thought by our representative that this appropriation will improve the conditions and our standing there; and I repeat that we ought to vote it up or vote it down without regard to anything else or any other question that might be tacked on to it.

There is a growing fear in this country, because of dissension expressed here, that we are not going to insist upon our rights

in the peace conference. Why do I say that? Has not the head of the Navy Department of the United States of America already said that we must build the greatest Navy in the world? Why? Because of the fear, evidently, that the freedom of the seas will not be properly safeguarded yonder in the world's peace conference in session now. That sentiment has been voiced by the head of the Navy Department. There has been distrust manifested by the military branch of the Government in saying what? That we must maintain a large Military Establishment, and also by some of the Senators here in saying that we must have universal military training. What is the purpose of it all? In order that we may be prepared and able to protect ourselves against any and all of the nations of the world when the necessity arises, at any and all times. Why have the greatest Navy on earth? Only to protect our rights and secure the freedom of the seas, which can and should be safeguarded in the world's peace conference. Freedom of the seas means that all of our merchantmen, all our liners, and all our Navy shall have the right to the unrestricted use of all the seas of all the world in peace times and in war, subject only to those well-defined rules and practices that have from long usage grown up, been adopted, recognized, and established by international law and such others as shall be determined upon by the peace conference now in session. If we shall have the greatest Navy in the world, it will make no difference to us, of course, about the principle of the freedom of the seas. That is the condition that confronts us yonder. Our representatives are on the ground; our treasure has been expended; our soldiers have nobly laid down their lives at our country's call; the war has been fought and won; and now let us conclude the peace terms and close it out successfully. Our representative, the President, has said that it can best be done by this contribution to alleviate the starvation and want of the people of the nations of the world, who must have help now, and we are the people to supply it. Shall we disparage the influence of our representative, the President of the United States, by refusing to follow his recommendation at the very time when it ought to be greatest?

We are committed to this policy by him, we are committed to this recommendation; we are able to carry it out; I believe it will be worth the money; and I say here to-day and now that we ought to pass on this bill alone, by itself, absolutely separate from all other questions, and either vote for it or vote against it; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to vote for it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, whatever my personal views may be with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], I do not believe that it ought to be put on this bill. We have already acted along the lines of the amendment, not going so far, however, as the Senator from Arizona would go, and probably not so far as I would go; but, as I have said, I do not think that it ought to go on this bill.

In connection with certain discussions that have been had with reference to it, I think it quite appropriate that I should read a letter that I received this morning from a soldier with reference to the proposition involved, and especially referring to a proposition being advanced in the country, which seems to have a great deal of support behind it. It is being urged very strenuously that the Government of the United States should pay \$300 to every soldier upon his discharge. I am getting letter after letter urging this. I received several such letters this morning.

As I have said, I have a letter here from a soldier which I wish to read. I believe that it expresses very largely the views of the soldiers themselves, and I am going to read it. It is dated January 15, 1918, but it evidently means 1919, and is from a place in my State.

I might preface my remarks by saying that I am a returned soldier, and as such I believe my opinion has more weight than that of a number of people who are advocating giving the soldiers who are discharged something for nothing. I refer to the agitation to give each man \$300 to assist him in reestablishing himself in civil life. It is my opinion that while each man who is discharged should receive some extra compensation, that sum of money, above mentioned, given to the men would serve more to promote idleness than to encourage a keenness for seeking positions of usefulness in civil life.

The men in the camps awaiting their discharge are at the present time practically wasting their time doing "bunk" fatigue, as we called it, and idleness started in this manner should receive no further subsidy after a man is discharged.

I do not believe, however, in the present policy of sending the men away from the camps practically penniless, because a fellow needs about \$100 to outfit himself with civilian clothing and support himself during a reasonable period of time prior to employment.

A sum which is comparatively small to the \$1,200,000,000 necessary to pay each discharged man \$300 could be spent far more effectively in enlarging the activities of the Federal Bureau of Labor, and cooperating with the States in reclaiming lands, stimulating land settlement, and making permanent public improvements, and in many other ways aiding in the employment of returned soldiers, unable otherwise to secure work.

This man does not even ask the Government to give them that gratuity of \$100. He says that they are ready and willing to work for it.

When I entered the service I sacrificed much, but feel that the self-satisfaction from making the sacrifice would be largely counteracted by any money I am not entitled to now. When I was discharged I felt that all the country owed me was enough money to get out of the uniform and support for a month while I was locating some work which I was fitted to do.

That letter comes from a returned soldier. He signs his name to it. I shall not put the name in the RECORD, however.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I was going to ask the Senator to put the name of that writer in the RECORD, because he is a typical American soldier and I think deserves the thanks of the Senate for expressing himself so candidly and so patriotically upon a very important proposition.

Mr. JONES of Washington. He signs his name. He does not give it in confidence. He does not ask me to withhold his name, and I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado and sympathize with it; but I also know what he might be subjected to if his name were published, and I believe I shall withhold the name at this time, at any rate.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to take just a few minutes in connection with the bill.

I do not know of any measure that has disturbed me so much as this measure. The more I examine the detailed reasons given for the passage of the bill the less reason I find for voting for it; and yet, when I look at the situation as it is, I am rather inclined to think that I shall support it, but not on the grounds of charity; not upon the detailed reasons set out in the various cablegrams that have been read to the Senate as to why it should pass, and what it will accomplish, and what it will bring about. I do not believe that the passage of this measure will hinder the growth or development of bolshevism. Really, I am afraid that it will encourage it rather than retard it, for reasons that I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into; but, Mr. President, this is the situation as it appears to me:

The war, no matter what we may say, is not yet ended. It has not been concluded. The President of the United States is striving to secure a peace that will conclude the war. He is our constitutional representative, acting within the limits of the Constitution and, I think, within the powers given to him. He has seen fit to place himself upon the peace commission, and he has gone to Europe to negotiate, upon the part of the United States, a peace that will conclude the greatest war that the world has ever experienced. He is there as our representative. As a matter of fact, he is our real representative on that commission. The other members of the commission are simply puppets or dummies upon the commission. The President is the commission. Whatever he says, so far as the action of this country is concerned, will be done. He represents us and our country. Now, he says to us this in his cablegram:

Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solution of peace.

Mr. President, I may not agree with that utterance; I may not believe that the President is right in expressing that opinion, or that his judgment is correct, but he is on the ground. He ought to know the situation better than I do; and as the representative of this Government, as the Commander in Chief of our Army, as the constitutional representative of this country in the negotiation of a treaty of peace, he solemnly states to Congress that the food situation is the key to the solution of peace, and he asks us to pass this measure as a measure to help in bringing about peace. In other words, he asks the passage of this bill as a war measure, as a measure to properly conclude this war.

I have voted during the conduct of this war for many measures the wisdom of which I doubted. I have supported every proposition that was considered necessary and essential to the proper prosecution of this war; and if the President is right in this statement, this measure is just as essential as a war measure, as a measure to conclude the treaty of peace that we hope will end war hereafter, as any other measure that has come before Congress during the last two or three years.

Mr. President, if I vote for the measure—and I rather think now that I will—it will be solely upon that ground. I hope the amendments that have been put in the bill will be eliminated. They ought not to be in this measure. If this is necessary, the President ought to have it without any strings on it. If it is not necessary, if we do not believe that it ought to be passed, then we ought to reject it outright.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to take the time of the Senate for just a few minutes to discuss briefly a matter that was referred to incidentally yesterday, a matter that I think is of

tremendous importance, and the facts regarding which the American people should know.

I am not disposed to criticize the administration for every mistake made in connection with the war. Mistakes were bound to be made in the carrying on of such a huge undertaking. We may justly be more critical now, although mistakes will occur now for which no one can be justly blamed. The winning of the war, however, will not now furnish an excuse for failures that common prudence and reasonable business judgment would have avoided.

There is a great deal of talk about reconstruction and the problems of reconstruction. The problems that confront us are not the problems of reconstruction, but the problems of readjustment. Our cities, properties, and industries have not been destroyed. Growth and development have simply been stopped or checked. Industry, energy, and resources have been diverted from their usual activities into war production and activity. The problem now is to readjust and get back to normal.

Labor must go from war work to peace work. Its hours must be rearranged. The demand for it will doubtless affect wages. Capital must seek new lines of employment. Its use and activity will depend much upon the prospect of a good return. Its activity will greatly affect labor. If capital is idle, labor is unemployed.

There is much agitation now for undertaking all sorts of governmental works in order to furnish employment for war workers and returning soldiers. We may have to resort to some such means as a sort of reservoir to care for surplus labor until reasonably normal conditions come about. Whenever and wherever capital desires to make a legitimate investment that will employ American labor and demand American material, can anyone imagine a good reason for denying it the privilege of doing so?

Governmental agencies, however, are doing that very thing right now, and I hope this will receive attention. It deserves attention. It deserves the attention of Congress, and it seems to me it ought to command the attention of the people of the country, when they know what is being done. With men by the thousands going without work, capital is denied the right to engage in work that would employ thousands of laboring men and keep them employed for months to come. For such action I can see no justification. It is more than a mistake. It is utter incompetency. The facts are undisputed, and the responsibility is clear. I propose to call to the attention of the Senate and of the country a few of these facts, and I also propose to show where the responsibility lies.

We are engaged in carrying on a great shipbuilding program. Three billion or more dollars of the people's money are being put into shipyards, docks, and ships. The old American spirit that helped put American ships in every port and our flag on every sea is awakening. With an eye to the future, American capital has gone into American shipyards or is ready to go into the shipbuilding industry, notwithstanding governmental activities. While the war was on these yards were a great national asset. Now that the war is closed why should they be denied work that seeks them and that would in no way interfere with the Government's program?

What are the facts? When the war ceased Norway wanted a million tons of wooden ships built. Her tonnage had been ruthlessly destroyed. She wanted to replace it. To her seafaring people the world's sea commerce was most inviting. Her capitalists came to our shipyards. The yards were ready to build these ships, but permits to build for foreign account had to be secured from the Shipping Board. They could not be secured. These contracts went to British builders. American labor was idle, American capital unemployed, American material unused.

On December 6, 1918, the Shipping Board removed the restrictions against building wooden ships for foreign account without a permit, and since then American yards can build wooden ships for foreign accounts without waiting for permission from the Government. This opportunity is gone, however. One or two hundred millions of dollars that should have gone to our labor and producers has gone to a foreign country that was wise enough to act for her own interests as soon as the war closed. Forty wooden ships are to-day building in British Columbia that would have been built at Tacoma, Wash., if a permit could have been secured. Is this a mere mistake? Is there any reasonable excuse for it? Thousands of American laborers are idle who would have had months of employment at good wages. Does this aid in reconstruction, in readjustment?

There are idle shipyards in this country to-day. Capital wants to let contracts for the construction of steel ships. These idle shipyards can not take these contracts. Why not? Because these ships are for foreign account, and these yards can not take

contracts for foreign account without a permit from the United States Shipping Board, and the United States Shipping Board will not give the permits. Perhaps it would be better for me to say it can not give them, for the reason that I shall show just a little bit later.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator is going to refer to an article that appeared on the first page of the Washington Post this morning, which indicated that there was a difference of opinion between the President and Mr. Hurley as to what the policy should be in this matter.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I did not intend to refer to that article. I saw it. It is the surmise of a newspaper man. He does not know anything about it. There are all sorts of surmises around here as to why this policy is being pursued. I have had no intimation from any source that Mr. Hurley believes differently, or believes in a different policy; but I have an authoritative statement showing how the other members of the Shipping Board feel about it, and I shall refer to it a little bit later on.

The Foundation Co. put in a wooden-ship yard at Tacoma, Wash., and other yards elsewhere. This yard was put in with French money and took a contract to build 20 wooden ships for France. It completed its contract a short time after the armistice was signed. France wants steel ships. She wants them in a hurry. She began negotiations with the people who had invested their money in the shipyards at Tacoma and Portland and at other points in this country. She wanted one hundred and fifty 8,800-ton ships. These wooden-ship yards could be converted into steel yards in 60 days. The owners wanted to do it. They could not get a permit, however, to build these steel ships. The Tacoma yard is idle to-day, although it is anxious to construct these ships. American labor is unemployed and American material is unused. I am reliably informed that the French have let contracts to British shipbuilders for over 300,000 tons of these steel ships, and it is very likely that contracts will soon be let for the whole amount. Our policy may be wise, but I can not see it. The American people may applaud it, but I do not believe so. Such a course may assist in readjustment, but it seems to me it will make it more difficult.

The Norway-Pacific Construction & Dry Dock Co. has put in a splendid yard at Everett, Wash. I had an opportunity to visit that yard two or three months ago. It is up to date in every respect. They have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in getting ready, hoping, of course, to get contracts from the Government for the building of ships, as well as contracts from private people. It is ready and anxious to build ships. It can get no contracts from this Government. Norwegian interests are anxious to give it contracts for several large steel ships, ships of 12,000 tons and over, costing a million and a half or two million dollars. It can not take them because it can not get a permit from the United States Shipping Board. That shipyard is idle.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HARDING. Does the Senator know of any good reason why these permits should not be granted?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am going to give the reasons in just a little while.

The labor of that community is unemployed, and these contracts will doubtless go to another country and the employment of other labor.

I want to read an extract from a letter that I received the other day from this company. It says:

Our yard is now practically completed and we are in a position to take on contracts for three years' work the minute we are authorized to construct for foreign account, and, as you know, our yard will alone employ from three to four thousand men, and as we are going to give preference to returned soldiers, there seems to me to be an additional legitimate reason why the Shipping Board should act.

Talk about the necessity for reconstruction and the necessity for readjustment, where is there a better aid to readjustment and reconstruction than to permit our capital to work when it wants to work and when demands upon it are being made that it can fulfill?

Mr. President, Italy wants steel ships built. She needs as many as France. Her capital has come to our shipyards. It has sought contracts from them. They can not build for her. Why? They can not get any permit from the United States Shipping Board.

I may be wrong, but it seems to me almost criminal that our people can not take these contracts. It is past belief that any Government would deny to its labor and its capital such opportunities for employment. Contracts of a half billion dollars or more would have been let in this country for this kind of work if this policy had not been pursued.

Why does the United States Shipping Board follow this policy? Why does it deny these permits? Why does it not aid in our readjustment problems by allowing these hundreds of millions of foreign capital to come in here and employ our labor and buy our materials? Let it speak for itself. In a letter to the Commerce Committee of the Senate regarding S. 5292, "Making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account," introduced by me, it says, through its acting chairman:

Now, listen. This comes from the Shipping Board itself; and I have the letter in my hand, dated January 18, 1919, addressed to Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, signed by John A. Donald, acting chairman. He says:

I may say that ever since the signing of the armistice the board has been constantly giving its interested attention to the subject touched upon by this bill. Those of us who are here—

And, Mr. President, the great majority of that board is here—

Those of us who are here are quite firmly of the conviction that permission should be granted to American yards for construction therein of vessels for approved foreign account.

So the United States Shipping Board would grant these permits. It would remove these restrictions. Why does it not do it? Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, will not let it do it. How do I know that? In answer to my resolution, Senate resolution 389, the United States Shipping Board, called on for information with reference to these matters, submitted a report. The report is now in the hands of the Senate, Senate Document 334, that any Senator can get. The Shipping Board says, and it refers to this in the letter to Senator FLETCHER:

On the same day war-time restrictions upon the construction of steel ships in American yards—

Referring to the date when the restrictions were removed with reference to the building of wooden ships—

On the same day war-time restrictions upon the construction of steel ships in American yards for domestic account were removed, but the restriction upon such construction for foreign account have not been removed.

Listen!

This restriction remains in force temporarily by direction of the President, whose delegate the Shipping Board is in the exercise of his authority.

There is the reason why the Shipping Board, notwithstanding its firm belief that these restrictions should be removed, does not remove them.

Mr. President, I shall not speculate upon why the President does not remove these restrictions. I shall not speculate as to why he prevents our people from getting these contracts and allows the contracts to be turned to foreign yards that will be competing with us not only in the building of ships but in the operation of ships in the world trade in the very near future. He has not thus far seen fit to give any reasons to us or the people for this policy.

Mr. President, we were asked to give up our just rights in the Panama Canal to help the President solve mysterious problems between this country and another country. We did it, and to this day no one knows what benefit it was to us.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. POINDEXTER. In this connection, at the time that under the peculiar request of the President Congress repealed the so-called free-of-tolls law, which had been placed upon the statute books, giving the benefit of this great waterway to American ships, it was asserted that treaties which we had with Great Britain required American ships to be upon the same basis as foreign ships. The sham and the fiction in that proposition is obvious from the fact that to-day and at all times since that proposition has been made American naval vessels pass through the canal without paying toll, while the naval vessels of other nations are required to pay toll, thereby demonstrating in actual practice that they do not believe and do not put into effect the proposition that there is any treaty requiring ships of America to be put upon the same basis as those of foreign nations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. My colleague is entirely right. After the armistice was entered into, and the war was practically over, Mr. Redfield, Secretary of Commerce, recommended that the United States should stand back and allow other countries to have the first chance at the world's export trade in order that they may rehabilitate themselves.

That seems to be the policy of reconstruction and readjustment that this administration would follow. It does not make any difference what the party designation of the administration is, I ask is such a policy in the interest of the American people

and American industry and American labor? Does it meet, can it meet, with the approval of any patriotic American?

And now, when we are confronted with the perplexing problems of peace, the President himself refuses to permit our shipyards to take contracts to build steel ships for foreign account. Foreign shipbuilding contracts are sought in American shipyards. These shipyards can not take these contracts because they can not get a permit to do so from their own Government. American shipyards are closed. American labor is idle. American resources are unused. Hundreds of millions of foreign capital wanting to come here is directed to foreign countries. Why? Because an American President, using the power given to him to carry on the war, refuses, for undisclosed reasons, to permit our people to take these contracts and build these ships. No reason is given to justify this action. None can be given to justify it.

It may be all right to try to rectify all the wrongs suffered by any country or people in Europe. It may be necessary to appropriate millions of dollars to enable the President to consummate a peace in harmony with his idealistic hopes and aspirations, but while we are doing this we have a right to ask him to have some regard for the rights and interests of our own people. Other peoples and governments are looking after their own interests. They expect us to look after ours, and our people have the right to expect and to demand that an American policy be followed, protecting, safeguarding, and promoting the rights, interests, and welfare of the American people, labor, and industries.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished Senator from Washington, he will bear in mind that my amendment is not an amendment proposing to pay \$300.

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; I understood that.

Mr. ASHURST. I now ask unanimous consent to further perfect the amendment. I strike out the words "90 days" and insert "60 days," so that it will be only 60 days' pay. I wish further to perfect the amendment by adding at the end of the amendment the following proviso:

Provided, That payments made hereunder shall be confined solely to privates and noncommissioned officers.

I do not wish to say anything further.

Mr. THOMPSON. The two Houses of Congress have already passed a bill providing for one month's pay?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	Hollis	Nelson	Spencer
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Sterling
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Coit	Kenyon	Page	Thompson
Curtis	Kirby	Pittman	Townsend
Fletcher	La Follette	Polindexter	Trammell
France	Lenroot	Pollock	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Pomerene	Warren
Gay	McKellar	Saulsbury	Weeks
Gerry	McLean	Shafroth	Williams
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	Wolcott
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	
Henderson	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum is present.

Mr. MCLEAN. Mr. President, so many reasons have been urged by my colleagues in opposition to the pending bill that seem to me to have no bearing whatever upon the merits or demerits of the measure that I desire to state my reasons for voting for it. I think I can do so in a half dozen sentences.

It is an opportune time, no doubt, to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are a great many people in this country to-day who feel that our official charities, our national charities, are beginning and ending a very long way from home. We have given by voluntary contribution hundreds of millions of dollars to save our friends in Europe from disease and hunger. We have loaned to our allies billions of dollars for the purpose of enabling them to sustain their fighting strength during the war and to sustain their industrial fabric after the war until it can be readjusted to peace conditions. I am informed that the munition factories in France are still in operation, and that the bills are being paid with money which we have loaned to France. It is not strange, therefore, Mr. President, that the fifteen or twenty thousand munition workers who have been summarily discharged from the munition factories in the State of Connecticut should wonder why this Government should not be able to extend to them the same consideration that the French Government is extending to its war workers. If it had not been for the munition workers of

Connecticut, the Germans would have been in Paris by Christmas, 1914.

We have been informed in this debate that there are two or three hundred thousand men in this country who have already been discharged from their employment and are unable to find reemployment. I know that Mr. Gompers, the president of the American Federation of Labor, testified only a few days ago before the Committee on Education and Labor that little or nothing had been done to carry labor from a war to a peace basis; to use his exact language, he said that we were worse prepared for peace than we were for war when war was declared. This situation is to be lamented; there is no doubt about that. The lack of vision and the surplus of incompetency that has characterized the executive departments of this Government for the past six years are to be regretted; but it does not seem to me that this fact argues that Congress should abdicate its responsibilities in the premises. The fact that we have left undone in this country a great many things that ought to have been done does not argue that we should continue that policy in this country or extend it across the water.

I do not look upon this appropriation as a charity. I look upon it as a war measure. If the President accomplishes what he tells us he expects to accomplish, it will be the best investment that the United States of America has ever made. As a taxpayer, and, I believe, representing the taxpayers of this country, I shall vote for this bill because the taxpayer knows that it is a great deal cheaper to buy peace than it is to fight for it, if it can be done honorably—and there is nothing dishonorable in acting the good Samaritan.

We hope that the war against imperialism has been won. It has been a war of destruction; it has cost the allies, including this Government, more than \$100,000,000,000 and more than 10,000,000 precious lives. Now, it seems to me, Mr. President, that it will be very much wiser for the United States to invest a hundred million dollars a month for the next two or three months if it is necessary to win the war that is now on—the war against anarchy and ignorance—than it will be to decline to do it until possibly our honor is again involved, for that will mean the killing of more American boys and the expenditure of billions of dollars. We have had enough of that. It seems to me, sir, that this is no time for penny wisdom. We must see this thing through, for every taxpayer in this country knows, and I think every patriot knows, that if ignorance and anarchy are permitted to throttle democracy in Europe in the next six months there will be no peace anywhere for anybody during the next 25 years. That is the reason why I shall vote for this bill.

I believe this legislation is wise from a purely humanitarian standpoint, but I also believe that it is wise as a pure business proposition. I think it is wise because I do not see how we can expect to fulfill the mission which we undertook in April, 1917, unless within the next few months we secure not only armed peace but also industrial peace in Europe.

It is all very well for the eloquent Senators who have preceded me to state their belief that we ought to have an American policy; that we ought to protect our soldiers, and so forth. So we ought, and we are trying to do it this morning. We ought to protect our civil liberty in this country, as was so ably presented by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] yesterday. All these things we ought to do, but in doing them why should we postpone a simple proposition like that presented by the President of the United States, calling for what I believe to be a wise investment, an insurance that within a reasonable time we may expect to have industrial peace and law and order established in Europe, without which the future of this country might be such that I dare not attempt to describe it?

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] has introduced an amendment, the purpose of which is well enough, but the effect of which will be to postpone ultimate action upon this measure beyond the time when it will do any good. He ought to know that, if it is adopted, it will not in any way change the personnel of the men who will administer this fund. The President will nominate Mr. Hoover as the chairman of the commission, and he will either be confirmed or this bill will never become a law. For that reason I shall vote against the amendment. I believe that time is the essence of this transaction if it is to be of any benefit to this country.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, like other Senators, I have had much difficulty in making up my mind as to how I should vote on this measure. When it was first submitted to the House, indeed after it came to the Senate, my heart prompted me to support it because I confess that I looked upon it more as a matter of charity than in any other light, and I knew there must be great suffering in Europe; but the discus-

sion of the matter since it has come here has disillusioned me. Now, its proponents all claim, I believe, that charity has nothing to do with it; that we are about to vote this appropriation upon the request of the President, because he has stated that this action is necessary in order to enable him to carry out his plan as the representative of this Government at the peace conference.

I have read his reasons, if they can be called such, as stated in his cablegram, in which he says that food is now the key to the situation, because Bolshevism can be stopped not by force but by food. I take it, therefore, that this is the object he has in asking for this appropriation. It seems to me scarcely thinkable that any amount of money which we might appropriate now would stop Bolshevism, because, if it is simply a proposition to buy off the people who are against law and order, the money which they thus easily obtain will have to be duplicated many, many times, and we shall get no such results as are anticipated, and this appropriation is but the beginning of a scheme involving the expenditure of billions of money.

Since the war began I have voted, as other Senators have, for very many measures on the ipse dixit of the President. We have felt in our hearts that many of those measures were wrong, and I submit that experience has demonstrated that we were right; but yet we were told they were necessary to win the war, and therefore we were practically coerced into supporting measures which our judgment told us were not proper ones to pass.

The President has said several times that the war is over, and yet he now presents this proposition to us as a war measure. We knew nothing about what the policy of the President was when he started on his self-appointed mission to Europe. We have learned nothing authentic about it since. We know more about royalty in Europe than we ever heard of before, and of the overloads of generosity to our President and his estimable wife, but we know nothing of the peace plans. We read now and then of secret conferences that are being held by our President and certain prominent people in Europe, but "open covenants openly arrived at" have not been obtained and, it seems to me, have not even been seriously attempted; so that the Congress of the United States knows absolutely nothing about what policy the President may have in mind. It is this doubt which causes me to hesitate in this matter.

It is claimed that he is over there for the purpose of setting up governments. There are many eminent Senators in this body who believe that that is a proper thing to do. I have never had any sympathy with that idea myself, Mr. President, because I have felt that our business after destroying the Imperial German Government was here at home, and that we could not afford to set up governments all over Europe, doubtful experiments, to be maintained by armed forces supplied by citizens of the United States. I think it will develop into a very bad policy; and yet, if we are to believe the press and the advocates and the supporters of the President here, that is one of the things the President is trying to do.

It was reported that he was passing over Europe for the purpose of creating public sentiment in Europe in favor of his ideas of what ought to be done at the peace convention. I have forgotten who it was, but one Senator expressed my thought, on yesterday, I think, when he asked, What would we think here in the United States if that conference had been called at Washington and peace representatives of France, Japan, and England were here traveling through our country addressing our people for the purpose of creating sentiment in favor of such propaganda as they might see fit to inaugurate? I have felt that it was the duty of our representative—because we have only one—to go to Europe to confer with the representatives of the allied nations, not to confound them by inciting public opinion against them.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did you notice this morning in the press—I have not the paper with me, but Senators will recall its glaring headlines in the Post—where it was stated "Wilson, France, and England" are conferring over the disposition of Russia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HITCHCOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. TOWNSEND. In a moment. Think of the proposition for a minute. An individual is named—not the United States but "Wilson," as the paper calls him, in conference with France and England! Our one representative over there, whose plans and policies are unknown to the people of the United States, suggests this doubtful proposition, as it seems to me, which proposes to appropriate \$100,000,000, not for charity, not to relieve the suffering people of Europe because they are suffering, but to

be used as a bribe for the purpose of buying Bolsheviks into good behavior.

Now I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, in justice to history, and conscious of the very eminent fairness of the able Senator from Michigan, replying to the observation which attracted the Senator's attention, asking what our people would think if some foreign representative came to us to inculcate his doctrines, I beg to call the eminent Senator's attention to the fact that we sent Henry Ward Beecher, one of the eminent divines of the earth, to England, and there he espoused and presented the cause of our Republic and the doctrines of Mr. Lincoln to the people of England, with a view of avoiding their sympathy with those who were seeking secession and destruction of the Republic.

I also invite my eminent friend to recall that Kossuth, of Hungary, came to this country, and was entertained, as he should have been, to present the doctrines of liberty for people rising against an imperial despotism, and we received him gladly, as I am sure any other delegate upon a similar mission would be received.

I merely ask my able friend, knowing his eminent fairness and scholarly attainments, if he does not recall those illustrations as very pertinent to the occasion?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do, Mr. President, now that the Senator has brought them to my mind; but the cases are not parallel. Beecher was sent to a neutral nation that was not interested in a controversy between the two divisions of the United States. It was perfectly proper to create sentiment in favor of a proposition on the part of neutral nations; but France and England and Italy are vitally interested in the questions that we are interested in, and have all selected delegates to meet in common council to represent their Governments. In my judgment, it is entirely improper for a representative of this Government to that conference to try to influence the constituents of the representatives at the peace conference of a foreign country. The cases are entirely different.

But, Mr. President, I do not wish unduly to criticize the President, although now it seems to me the ban is off, and we as a Congress ought to act according to our judgment. We have a right to demand that there shall be light thrown upon this subject before we vote these hundred million dollars. The Senator from Connecticut says it is a cheap investment to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of establishing law and order in Europe. Oh, indeed, it would be. If that were assured, if that were the probable outcome of the investment, I should say by all means it was the proper thing to do. I feel sure it will not even contribute to that result.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. SWANSON. I hope the Senator desires to be fair in stating the proposition of the President. As I understand, the proposition of the President resolves itself into two heads. First, he states that there is a necessity for food, there is starvation, there is want, in Europe. He makes that proposition. He is there. He has made an investigation. On the question of charity alone, it seems to me, we should respond to that. But he goes further. Outside of a question of charity, the self-interest of the world demands that a condition of starvation, of lack of food, of want, should be eliminated, because if it is not, the people who are in want, and starving, and lack food, are dangerous. They have Bolshevism. They are anarchistic. Consequently, the President submits to the American people two propositions. From the standpoint of charity this should be done. From the standpoint of self-interest alone it will be wise to make this appropriation. It seems to me that would be a fair interpretation of the President's message.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia is the only proponent of the measure whom I have heard who admits that one of the objects of this bill is charity. Every other man whom I have heard—I presume there are other Senators who have said it; perhaps the chairman of the committee did, but I did not hear his statement—all of the other Senators who have spoken on this subject, in favor of the appropriation, said that it was not charity and that they would not support it if it was.

Mr. SWANSON. I am not discussing the other Senators. I am not discussing what other Senators say. The Senator was criticizing the position of the President of the United States. I say that any fair, just interpretation of his message would have two points in it. There is want, there is lack of food, there is starvation, in Europe. Charity ought to justify us in

making the appropriation. But, further than that, the President takes the position that even if we did not do it for charity, wisdom, sense, and judgment require us not to have Europe in a state of starvation, because starvation produces anarchy; starvation produces conditions that are opposed to order and the best interests of humanity. It seems to me that any fair interpretation of the message sent by the President would convey those two ideas.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, in the discussion of this question I have been trying to answer some of the arguments that have been presented in favor of the passage of this measure; but, as the Senator suggests, I certainly do not wish to be unfair to the President. As disclosed by his cablegram to his private secretary, Mr. Tumulty, he said this—it has been placed in the Record several times:

I can not too earnestly or solemnly urge upon the Congress the appropriation for which Mr. Hoover has asked for the administration of food relief. Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solution of peace. Bolshevism is steadily advancing westward, has overwhelmed Poland, and is poisoning Germany.

I supposed that Germany was about as thoroughly poisoned as it was possible to imagine; and if this argument is of any effect, that you are going to stop the spread of Bolshevism—because that is the object of this appropriation, whatever the Senator from Virginia may state; the object is to bring about peace through the checking of Bolshevism, which—

Mr. SWANSON rose.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will ask the Senator not to interrupt me until I finish this statement—which the President states has spread over Poland and is poisoning Germany; and yet Germany is one of the parties to be considered in this peace convention. It is to make a peace growing out of the war with Germany; yet Senators admit here that no part of this money must be expended in Germany. No part of it must be expended there, but the poisoning process must be continued, for by amendment the money can not be used to check Bolshevism or to prevent starvation in the central governments. Yet, I submit, if there is any logic at all in this proposal, if there is any reason for this appropriation, some of it ought to be spent in Germany for the purpose of feeding people there and stopping Bolshevism, in order that a government may be established which can be dealt with by the United States; for whatever treaty is made affecting all the nations of Europe, it must take in those governments which will grow out of Germany when it is reconstructed.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield now for a question.

Mr. SWANSON. I was suggesting that the Senator had not entirely interpreted properly the message of the President. He says the issue in Europe is food. Lack of food encourages anarchy and Bolshevism. Now, those are the two propositions, it seems to me, from the very sentence that the Senator read from the message of the President.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will put it all in, and let the Senate and the country decide whether I am right or wrong in my interpretation.

Mr. SWANSON. Let me ask the Senator this question: If Germany is not included, the Senator can correct that very easily. If that is the reason why he does not favor it, he can very easily correct that by offering an amendment to include Germany.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I do not oppose it for that. I do not favor it at all; but I say the bill has already been amended so as to exclude the expenditure of any money in Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, or Turkey.

Mr. SWANSON. But if the Senator thinks that is wrong, he can offer an amendment to correct it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not think it is wrong.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, will the Senator indicate from what page of the Record he is reading?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am reading from page 1753. I supposed that everybody had read the President's message to his secretary. I desire, Mr. President, to have the whole of that cablegram inserted. I read only part of it. I want it all printed in the Record, so that the Record may be complete on that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

PARIS, January 11, 1919.

TUMULTY.

The White House, Washington:

Please convey following confidential message to Senator MARTIN and Congressman SWAGAR SHERLEY:

"I can not too earnestly or solemnly urge upon the Congress the appropriation for which Mr. Hoover has asked for the administration of food relief. Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solution of peace. Bolshevism is steadily advancing westward, has overwhelmed Poland, and is poisoning Germany. It

can not be stopped by force, but it can be stopped by food, and all the leaders with whom I am in conference agree that concerted action in this matter is of immediate and vital importance. The money will not be spent for food for Germany itself, because Germany can buy its food, but it will be spent for financing the movement of food to our real friends in Poland and to the people of the liberated units of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and to our associates in the Balkans. I beg that you will present this matter with all possible urgency and force to the Congress. I do not see how we can find definite powers with whom to conclude peace unless this means of stemming the tide of anarchy is employed."

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I also desire to insert, in connection with the reference that I made a little while ago to an article in the Post, which has just been handed me, the heading of the article in the morning Post, on the first page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the request will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Wilson, France, and England to Present League Memorials. (By the Associated Press.) Paris, January 21.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not like to stand in the Senate or elsewhere and protest against sending relief which this country can afford to send under proper conditions to distressed people anywhere. There may be some doubts as to our constitutional power to do that as a matter of charity, and yet it appeals to my heart very strongly; but the reasons which have been given in support of this proposition do not meet with my approval—scarcely any of them at all, in fact—and I do not wish to carry on further this practice or custom of voting the people's money to and conferring power upon the President simply because he demands that it be done. I want information. I think we have a right to know what is to be done with the appropriation and why and where it is to be expended. The Senate can no longer stultify itself by stifling its judgment and abandoning its prerogatives.

I could dwell to great lengths upon the financial needs of our country at this time, although I think our Government is able to grant this money if it is necessary and at the same time supply the necessities of our own people; but the fact is that we are neglecting our own home interests, and that condition will continue so long as this peace parley lasts. More than 10 weeks ago the President and his party landed in Europe. What has been done there we only know from conflicting newspaper reports. All agree, however, that our distinguished President has been royally entertained. There have been held secret conferences by separate little groups throughout Europe. Up until a few days ago, however, the conference had not been convened. During the last week meetings of an hour's length have been held almost daily. If we are to have normal conditions restored in this country, this peace question must be settled, the plans of which are entirely locked in the brain of the President, so far as our interests are concerned.

The country has a right to know what is going to happen over there in Europe, and the sooner it is known the better. When we pass a bill here at present we have to send it by special messenger across the sea over to the President, and after he has considered it in due course of time it comes back. I do not know how many emergency bills have been enacted weeks ago that have not yet been approved, but I believe there are many. The President ought to finish his business at Versailles, which is the peace treaty, settling the war with Germany, and then leave all other questions to be settled later. There is no danger of war in this country in the immediate future. The four great allied powers that were engaged in the war have the absolute control of peace and war for years, if not centuries, to come; although, Mr. President, I am not objecting to the consideration of a treaty or of a plan for a league of nations, if it can be properly drawn. I confess I do not see how one can be drawn that will be of much consequence and protect the rights of the United States, in which I am greatly interested. I do not know, but I think it is possible through months of deliberation to form an effective and safe league of nations to enforce peace, and I am favorable to it; but it will and should take a long time to get up a proposal for a league that will be recognized as safe and proper by the leading nations of the world. I want my country protected; but I protest against the United States entering into compacts which will oblige us to keep our soldiers in the Eastern Continent to defend with armed force these little experimental nations which it is proposed to set up all over continental Europe and in Asia. Those are their problems. We have problems of our own here. We have quite enough to do to solve them in accordance with our traditions and ideals. Our Government can help the world by an example of true, representative democracy here. Hasty action in these disturbed times might, and probably would, prove disastrous to the ideals of our Republic. What are the President's plans for Russia and Germany and Turkey? Should we vote \$100,000,000

of the people's money to carry out those plans, which are unknown to us?

So, Mr. President, while I have arrived at my conclusion slowly, having some doubts as to what I ought to do, I am now convinced, after hearing the arguments of practically all the proponents of this measure, that it is my duty as a representative of the people of the United States to vote against this experiment simply on the request of the President of the United States, who is living and has been living for 9 or 10 weeks under peculiar environments, nobody knowing exactly what they are, but living in an atmosphere unlike our own, alienated to some extent from the very pressing needs which are here at home.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I noticed in the communication from the President to the President's private secretary, in the latter part of it, it is insisted that the use of this money which is to be appropriated by the bill if enacted, with other funds contributed by the allies, is the only means of stemming the tide of anarchism. I wish to ask the Senator in view of this whether there is any such tide in this country, if we are to take the word of certain distinguished gentlemen about our own domestic affairs. Last fall, some time before the President left our shores, he said in a letter to the central committee of his party in the State of New Jersey that he hoped he would be able when the men were mustered out of the service to see that they did not return to economic serfdom in this country. Normal Angell, an Englishman of some note, a publicist, a short time before that came to this country and delivered himself of an address in New York City, in which he said that the United States Constitution was the worst constitution in the world. Louis F. Post, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, upon divers occasions has taken occasion to remark that labor was oppressed; that a laboring man had no rights in this Government; and that unless something was done an explosion would occur in our own country. What does the Senator think about these distinguished authorities, beginning with the President, as to whether we have anything worthy of attention at home, especially in view of an authority of the American Federation of Labor not long ago, wherein he said that before spring came we would have bread lines and great armies of unemployed in our own country?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I believe we are living under most serious conditions, but I am not so apprehensive as very many men are over the future. I confess that my mail contains many letters which are quite disturbing. A great many demands are made which it seems to me are unwarranted, and there is a general feeling on the part of a great many people that many of the returned soldiers are going to be a source of great disturbance to the country.

I do not believe these soldiers are now being treated properly. Many of them are held in cantonments and camps when they ought to be at home. Many are denied opportunities to engage in profitable employment by being held in the Army when they are no longer needed. I am told, although I have not been able to demonstrate its truth, but I confess I have some faith in the statement, that there are certain officers in the Army who like to have their units retained. These officers never had so prominent a position before in their lives and they would like to keep their men in line as long as possible. Some of the soldiers are almost in rebellion because of the treatment they have received and are now receiving. Their allotments to their loved ones have not been paid, their mail does not reach them, and their requests for discharge are contemptuously treated.

But, Mr. President, I have such faith in the boys who constituted our Army, that did so much to save the world from Prussian despotism, that I believe they are going to constitute the balance for law and order in this country after the war is over and the works of peace are again resumed. I know how many of them feel about the conditions to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] has referred. They have seen cantonments built throughout the country. They have seen the loafing on the job, the attempts to wrest money from the Treasury without rendering compensation in return. They have suffered from the profiteering of capital and labor and know where the blame lies. Their memories will be long, but their patriotic loyalty will also be long and true. Our soldiers feel deeply, but we can trust them. I do not like, however, to see indignities heaped upon them. I have protested against them, with little avail, and I will not in time of peace grant further autocratic power to this administration. We have on these shores stupendous tasks to perform. We have delayed already too long. I will not by vote of mine defer action on the domestic problems which require

solution in order that our time and Treasury may be devoted to the setting up and maintenance of governments for a score, more or less, of fleeting revolutionary nations in Europe and Asia.

Domestic problems, I say, require our attention. We are not giving it to them. There is a difference between the President and his Cabinet or subordinates here on certain great propositions, and, of course, they can not be settled until the President settles them. These things ought not to be in this critical hour when there are so many possibilities of danger arising on every hand; patriotism at home should be encouraged, because we need it quite as much now as we have needed it heretofore. There was no chance to make a mistake then. The country must be preserved. The flag was endangered and each must do his duty; but now after the war is over the people who fought that war are not going to be content with petty politics or with following out the dreams of some ambitious man or men who may seek notoriety and greater influence through doubtful experiments.

Mr. President, I have given as much attention to the subject as I could. I was prejudiced, as I have said, in favor of the bill when it was first presented and felt that I would vote for it, but the facts disclosed in the Senate discussion have convinced me that my duty to my country now compels me to vote against it.

I hope the Senator from Arizona will not attempt to complicate this measure by insisting upon an amendment which might possibly receive some votes if it stood on its own bottom and was not tied up with a measure that some of us at least feel in conscience bound to oppose.

Mr. LENROOT. I send to the desk a cablegram which I received day before yesterday, and I ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

PARIS.

Senator IRVINE LENROOT,
United States Senate:

Leaving for Scandinavia to-morrow in charge of northern relief. Everything depends upon Senate passing \$100,000,000 appropriation to provide food and prevent starving people from lapsing into bolshevism. Conditions extremely critical. Please help.

MAGNUS F. WENSON.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, the sender of this cablegram was until he left for Europe the food administrator of the State of Wisconsin. He is a man of very excellent judgment and of very high standing.

Mr. President, I expect to vote for this bill not as a charity, because I do not believe that Congress has any constitutional right to vote money for pure charity. I shall vote for it because I believe that the appropriation of this money will bring a resulting benefit to the people of the United States commensurate at least with the money that is involved.

Much has been said concerning the constitutional authority to appropriate this money. We will all concede, I think, that Congress has no right to appropriate money out of the Public Treasury for a pure charity, but I think we must also all concede that if there be a benefit flowing to the people of the United States from the appropriation of public money it is within the constitutional authority of Congress to make that appropriation.

A distinction should be made between the right of Congress to legislate upon the rights of persons and the right of Congress to legislate with reference to taxation and the appropriation of money. Our right to levy taxes is conferred by the Constitution, and the purposes for which we may do it is to pay the debts and promote the general welfare of the people. We have the constitutional right to appropriate money for any purpose that it can be fairly said will promote the general welfare of the people.

This question has been up a number of times in the Supreme Court of the United States, notably in the sugar-bounty cases, arising out of the act of 1890, in the case of Field against Clark, but the constitutional question was not decided.

Later the question came up with reference to the right of Congress to appropriate money to pay the claims of those who had incurred losses growing out of that legislation. That question came before the Supreme Court of the United States in United States against Realty Co., One hundred and sixty-third United States, and the syllabus contains this language:

It is within the constitutional power of Congress to determine whether claims upon the Public Treasury are founded upon moral and honorable obligations and upon principles of right and justice; and having decided such questions in the affirmative and having appropriated public money for the payment of such claims, its decision can rarely, if ever, be the subject of review by the judicial branch of the Government.

It is true that in the opinion in that case this language is used:

It is unnecessary to hold here that Congress has power to appropriate the public money in the Treasury for any purpose whatever which it may choose to say is in payment of a debt or for the purposes of the general welfare. A decision of that question may be postponed until it arises.

I can well imagine, Mr. President, that if it were a case of a pure charity, admitted to be such, the court might hold that that was beyond the power of Congress; but if the appropriation be made because of the belief of a resulting benefit to the people of this country, thus promoting the general welfare, it is clearly within our constitutional authority. I admit that Senators who regard this as purely a charity are correct in their position that so regarded it is not within our constitutional power, but those of us who believe that there is a resulting benefit to the people of this country can vote for this bill, satisfied that it is within our power.

In my view the appropriation of this \$100,000,000 or the appropriation of any other sum of money will not cure bolshevism. We can not cure bolshevism with food; we can not destroy bolshevism with bullets. But the appropriation of this money will do this: The distressed and starving peoples of these liberated countries, so long as they are starving, are not in a position to think and to reason concerning any stable form of government. They go with Bolshevists not because of any theory of government which the Bolshevists have but because of that portion of the Bolshevik theory, direct action and destruction and taking from those who have and giving to those who have not.

So long as peoples are starving and hungry, whether we call it bolshevism or not, we will have riots, we will have disorder; they will get food wherever they can get it; they will take it from those who have it; and they will not be thinking about what is the best form of government for their country. Relieved of that condition, those peoples then will begin to think of what form of government is best for them. Our hope is and must be that when the peoples of these liberated countries have an opportunity to think and to reason they will establish such a government as will be permanent and that will be for their own welfare.

I am not afraid of bolshevism being a permanent condition any more than I am afraid of anarchy being a permanent condition. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] yesterday in his very admirable address said if we must choose between the autocracy of Germany and anarchy he would prefer autocracy. That is true if we should assume for a moment that anarchy anywhere could be a permanent condition. But that is impossible. It never has been and never will be true. Anarchy, bolshevism, or whatever you choose to call it, is a temporary condition, and out of it will come sooner or later always either an autocracy or a representative government.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. At various times in the not remote past we have had bread lines in the United States. The condition was very serious in 1893 and 1894, and, as the Senator will recall, in 1913 and 1914 millions of people were out of employment, with soup houses everywhere and hunger staring everyone in the face. Was any proposition introduced into either body at that time to take money out of the Treasury with which to relieve that situation?

Mr. LENROOT. No; not that I know of.

Mr. WATSON. If that condition should come again, as we now have it freely prophesied throughout the country, and some proposition were to be introduced here to relieve the situation by taking money from the Treasury, would the Senator feel free to support it?

Mr. LENROOT. I will say in reply that depends entirely upon the conditions which then exist. I can conceive that I would be willing to appropriate money out of the Treasury of the United States for such a purpose, and I believe the Senator would, too. But that is not the question before us now.

The question before us now is whether the use of this money will assist in the formation of stable, permanent, well-organized governments and thus assist an earlier conclusion of the peace conference. Will any Senator say that if the liberated peoples in the Balkans, in Austria-Hungary outside of German Austria, in Poland, could have stable, organized, permanent governments the work of the peace conference would not be very much easier than it will be if chaos and anarchy reign?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator think the delay in the peace conference for the last six weeks has been by reason of those conditions in the liberated countries?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not.

Mr. BORAH. What Europe is dying of is procrastination.

Mr. LENROOT. I think so.

Mr. WATSON. May I ask the Senator as to the converse of that proposition? Does he think the condition he is so aptly describing here is in any part due to delay in arranging the terms of a peace treaty?

Mr. LENROOT. I think it very likely may be due in part to that, because I think the sooner a conclusion can come at the peace conference the sooner we may look for permanently organized governments over there.

But to return to my proposition, every Senator will admit, I think, that if we can hedge Germany about with organized government, either such as our own or upon the representative principle, the German menace for the future is very much lessened; and, after all, it is our business primarily at the peace conference to secure such a treaty of peace as will, so far as possible, remove for all time to come a repetition of the German menace that has confronted the world. So if feeding the hungry of those peoples will enable them to think about forming a permanent system of government that will stand, then food has assisted materially in bringing about a treaty of peace which will be permanent and one which may be ratified.

In addition to that, we have this proposition: The United States, we believe, is the best and highest form of government existent. We hope that these peoples over there will look sooner or later to the United States as their pattern and example for the formation of governments of their own. I think, Mr. President, with the action taken upon this bill, feeding the hungry, enabling them to think upon the kind of government that they shall have, they will be much better disposed toward this country that has done this thing and much better disposed to look upon our form of government as the most desirable than they otherwise would be.

Bolshevism, as I said a moment ago, to my mind is not a permanent menace. It can not long exist. I have in my hand an address delivered by Lenine, the premier of the so-called Russian Soviet republic, delivered a few months ago. Lenine is not an ignorant man. He is a very able man. He clearly recognizes in this address the difficulties which now confront his theory of government. In this address, after describing the first two stages of the Russian revolution, he says:

We are now in the third stage. Our gains, our decrees, our laws, our plans, must be secured by the solid forms of everyday labor discipline. This is the most difficult, but also the most promising problem, for only its solution will give us socialism. We must learn to combine the stormy, energetic breaking of all restraint on the part of the toiling masses with iron discipline during work, with absolute submission to the will of one person, the Soviet director, during work.

Here he recognizes that the government which they now have can not last long without a dictatorship. He proposes in the quotation which I have read a dictatorship only during work, and would permit them to go on unrestrained by any law, human or divine, when they are not at work.

A little later in the same address he uses this language:

The more firmly we now have to advocate a merciless and firm rule and dictatorship of individuals for definite processes of work during certain periods of purely executive functions the more diverse should be the forms and means of mass control in order to paralyze every possibility of distorting the Soviet rule in order to repeatedly and tirelessly remove the wild grass of bureaucratism.

In the same address he uses this language:

It is not hard to see that during any transition from capitalism to socialism a dictatorship is necessary for two main reasons or in two main directions. In the first place, it is impossible to conquer and destroy capitalism without the merciless suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, who can not be at once deprived of their wealth, of their advantages in organization and knowledge and who will, therefore, during quite a long period inevitably attempt to overthrow the hateful—to them—authority of the poor.

I was very much surprised, and I am sure Senators will be surprised if they have not already read this address, to find this socialistic Lenine in Russia advocating the application in Russia of the Taylor system of efficiency in the United States. I read as follows:

The Russian is a poor worker in comparison with the workers of the advanced nations, and this could not be otherwise under the régime of the Czar and other remnants of feudalism. To learn how to work, this problem the Soviet authority should present to the people in all its comprehensiveness. The last word of capitalism in this respect, the Taylor system, as well as all progressive measures of capitalism—combine the refined cruelty of bourgeois exploitation and a number of most valuable scientific attainments in the analysis of mechanical motions during work, in dismissing superfluous and useless motions, in determining the most correct methods of the work, the best systems of accounting and control, etc. The Soviet republic must adopt valuable scientific and technical advance in this field. The possibility of socialism will be determined by our success in combining the Soviet rule and the Soviet organization of management with the latest progressive measures of capitalism. We must introduce in Russia the study and the teaching of the Taylor system and its systematic trial and adaptation.

This means, Mr. President, that Premier Lenine clearly recognizes the difficulties which confront his system of government, difficulties which can not be overcome, because the Soviet system of government, even in its ideal form, is only one step removed from a pure democracy, and a pure democracy is absolutely impracticable for any nation. As I said, he recognizes that there must be a dictatorship under his proposed system, and a dictatorship never has endured and never will endure for any great length of time resting upon the consent of the people.

So it seems very clear to me that the Bolshevik system of government, if it can be called a system, is doomed to failure. If it shall make progress in the United States, the cause will not lie in Russia or any European country. If a time shall ever come when we shall go through in the United States a temporary stage of bolshevism, the fault will be our own because the remedy lies with us, and in an ever-increasing degree, in assuring the producer a greater share of that which he produces. If bolshevism is a menace to any of the European countries, it is not because of its origin in Russia, but it is because the conditions in the countries themselves have become intolerable and should be remedied by the governments there.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say it, the pomp and ceremony that is daily attending this peace conference in Paris, in my judgment, is doing almost as much to feed bolshevism as food can do to prevent it. The occurrences at Buckingham Palace a short time ago, with dinner plate costing \$15,000,000, the ostentatious display, the bowing and scraping, the emphasizing of class distinctions over there, I say, Mr. President, were most unfortunate at this particular stage in the history of the world. I am sorry that President Wilson when he went to Paris did not stay there and attend to the stupendous work—the important work—in hand.

True, the governing sovereigns of those countries have been showing President Wilson honor, but it is unfortunate, Mr. President, when millions of people are hungry and starving that all this pomp and display should be daily going on, emphasizing to them that here is a class that has much and here is a class that has nothing. I hope that during the balance of this peace conference all the negotiations may be conducted at Paris, and the less of this display in the future the better prospect there will be for a successful peace conference.

Mr. President, I shall vote for this bill for the reasons that I have given. I believe that it will assist in more quickly securing stable and more permanently organized governments of these liberated peoples. That being so, I believe it will assist the work of the peace conference if they can be assured that Poland is not only to be free but is to have a stable government, and so as to the different peoples of Austria and Hungary and the Balkan States.

So far as Russia is concerned, I am frank to say that, in my judgment, the Russian people must work out their own salvation. We can not cure the condition in Russia by force from without. We shall only feed the condition there if we attempt that. In Russia they will in time, as well as in these other countries, themselves evolve, through evolution and not through continued revolution, a stable government; but if we are to go in there with force we shall drive those Russian people together, and they will look upon this, the greatest democracy in the world, instead of being a government to pattern after, as one to avoid. Their only alternative, then, will be to go back to some form of autocracy.

In this connection, Mr. President, I desire to say that I hold in my hand a pamphlet which came to me yesterday—I presume it came to all of the Senators—entitled "The Russian democracy in its struggle against the Bolshevik tyranny," by Col. Vladimir I. Lebedeff, former secretary of the navy in the Russian provisional government and member of the all-Russian constituent assembly. He uses this language:

We may truthfully say that in the liberated regions of Russia bolshevism has ceased to exist. Only an insignificant minority of workmen still clings to it secretly. And this can be understood. The ideology of bolshevism has long been cast aside by the workmen themselves at all labor conferences and by the socialist parties, which lead the labor movement in Russia. The present-day bolshevism preserves its power only by the fact that while pretending to benefit the working class it gives the small minority which supports it the privilege of idleness, high salaries, and other advantages of the leisure class. Having printing presses at their disposal, the Bolsheviks issue enough paper money to be able to bribe their supporters as well as their soldiers.

In passing, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to another paragraph in this pamphlet. The writer, after speaking of the operations of the anti-Bolshevik forces upon the Volga River last July, says:

We are certain we could execute this plan since we knew of the landing of allied troops in Murmansk and Archangel, of their battles and movements toward Volodga, and of the proclamation in Archangel by the American ambassador, Mr. David Francis, in which he called upon the Russian people to fight the Bolsheviks, pledging the aid of the allies.

I should like to inquire—but I assume it is useless to inquire—where our ambassador to Russia received his authority to pledge the aid of the allies to this movement? I merely mention that in passing.

Mr. President, in concluding I desire to say that I shall vote for the bill for the reasons which I have stated.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] a short time ago stated his position on this question and condemned this bill on the ground, first, that, if it were a charity, it ought not to be granted; and, second, if it were intended to stop bolshevism, it should also not be passed by the Congress of the United States, because he did not think it would produce any such result.

Mr. President, there are ample precedents, as was shown by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARRIN] in the opening of the discussion on this bill, which have established that, even as a pure act of charity, this appropriation may properly be made. There have been any number of such precedents which have been passed by the Congress of the United States for the purpose of charitably aiding and assisting other governments. Notably, there was the one in the case of Italy, another for Venezuela, and a number for Cuba. In fact, I think the Senator from Virginia cited some half dozen instances in which the Government of the United States had passed measures of this kind purely as charity. Any Senator who desires to found his opinion and determination as to the vote he shall cast upon the pending measure can do so in view of the precedents for such action which have heretofore been established.

As has been shown by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LEXROO], a position in favor of the measure may be taken on the second ground; that is, the tendency it will have to stay the spread of bolshevism—to aid in creating stable governments in Europe. There is ample reason to sustain a vote in favor of the passage of the measure on that ground.

But, Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan did not call attention to one passage in the message of the President, and I desire to read merely that line of the cablegram for the purpose of making a statement with reference to it. In that message is contained this language:

I can not too earnestly or solemnly urge upon the Congress the appropriation for which Mr. Hoover has asked for the administration of food relief. Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solution of peace.

President Wilson is over in Europe as our agent, as the man to whom is intrusted the power of making a treaty of peace, which may or may not involve many questions which would have to be ratified by the Senate of the United States. President Wilson has been in Europe over a month; he has been looking into the conditions there, and he has come to the conclusion that this appropriation is of vital importance in the determination of the question of peace and the terms upon which peace shall be made. It is true he specifies further than that, that this appropriation is also necessary upon another ground.

Mr. President, we have spent in the prosecution of this war over \$30,000,000,000. Some Senators take one position as to the reasons for which we entered the war and some take another, but unquestionably one of the causes was for the purpose of extending democratic governments through the nations of the world and invoking the doctrine which has been the cornerstone of our great Government, namely, that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. We have spent this enormous sum of more than \$30,000,000,000, and the man we sent to Europe for the purpose of closing up this war on the best terms for the United States that can be obtained, and in order to obtain the best possible terms for the objects and purposes for which we entered the war, now says that this is of supreme importance.

What is a hundred million dollars contrasted with the amount of money that we have already expended in this war? One hundred million dollars is simply one-third of 1 per cent of that amount; that is all. Is it possible that we are going to have anything modified or changed with relation to the treaty of peace from what we would want by refusing to give an appropriation of one-third of 1 per cent? Should we not give in order to aid in consummating the kind of agreement which we desire?

Mr. President, it would simply be refusing the most insignificant thing, which might cause the failure to consummate and obtain one of the most vital concessions that may be asked by us in connection with the treaty.

Looking at it from that view, knowing that the President is earnest in this matter, knowing that he has better knowledge concerning the situation than have we, knowing that he says in this very dispatch that all of the allied nations have stated that this measure is imperative, I do not see how we can decline to make the appropriation. I do not care upon what

ground it is placed, whether it is that of pure charity or to stay the progress of bolshevism, or upon that higher ground which is specified in this very telegram, namely, that it is indispensable in order to make the most effective treaty of peace.

Mr. President, for these reasons I shall vote in favor of the appropriation.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.
Bankhead	Hollis	Moses	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Johnson, Cal.	Myers	Smoot
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Spencer
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Norris	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Swanson
Culberson	Kenyon	Page	Thomas
Cummins	Kirby	Polindexter	Thompson
Curtis	La Follette	Pollock	Townsend
Fletcher	Lenroot	Pomerene	Trammell
France	Lewis	Saulsbury	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Shafroth	Warren
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	Watson
Gerry	McNary	Sherman	Weeks
Harding	Martin, Ky.	Smith, Ariz.	Williams

Mr. GAY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained on official business.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WORCOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks I may relieve a little embarrassment to myself by saying that I did not suggest the absence of a quorum, so that it was not done for the purpose of calling in Senators to listen to any remarks that I might make.

Mr. President, for some two months I have felt intensely interested in the matter of providing some additional compensation to our soldiers who have carried on so successfully and to a triumphant conclusion the great war in which we have been engaged. Within a week or 10 days following the signing of the armistice I introduced a measure providing for them one month's additional pay. I did not restrict it to one month, because I felt that our men were not worthy and deserving of a greater amount, but as the situation confronted me at that time I felt more assured of success by limiting it to one month's pay. At that time the War Department was willing to approve the payment of 30 days' additional compensation.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] during the present week has introduced an amendment to the pending bill providing for 90 days' additional pay, and has modified it, as I understand now, to provide 60 days' additional pay. I wish to support most heartily his amendment. I believe that those who left their homes and firesides, gave up the pleasures and comforts of their associations, and went forth to bear arms in the interest of this country, the privates, at least, for the small pittance of \$30 a month, have not been amply paid for the service which they have rendered in behalf of the Republic, and that to give them an additional two months' pay is at least as little as we should do in recognition of the gratitude of the Nation and in commendation of the brave and heroic service which they have rendered.

This amendment restricts the payment to the privates and noncommissioned officers. I am anxious to see this policy successful and the allowance made upon the pending bill. So far as I am concerned, however, I would also be willing to make a certain allowance to the commissioned officers, say, an allowance of one month's additional pay. I do not quite understand why the commissioned officers, who have fulfilled their mission as a part of the war machinery of the country, who have acquitted themselves creditably and brought honor to the Nation they have represented upon the battle fields; should not be recognized in this tribute. No braver, more courageous, and loyal officers ever commanded upon a battle field.

But, as some of my colleagues seem to differ with me upon this question, I am giving my hearty support to the amendment in its present form providing for two months' additional pay for privates and noncommissioned officers.

This amendment suits me a great deal better than the one which I submitted some two months ago, and which I have

been trying for the past 60 days to get enacted into law. Within a week after the armistice was signed I offered the amendment to which I have referred. I felt that we should act quickly, and that we should have the law enacted so that, as our soldiers returned and were demobilized, and as those who were in our own camps were being demobilized, they could then be paid this additional sum.

I have found from my contact with a great many discharged soldiers that they are leaving the service almost penniless. A few days ago I was riding on a train with one who told me that while he was in the service he had contributed toward the allowance for the support of his parents and in the payment of his insurance all of his salary except \$7.65 per month. So Senators may well realize that that patriotic, brave, heroic young man when he returns again to private life needs a helping hand. Who should more properly extend to him that helping hand than the Government which he has been serving?

I was very much surprised in talking with him to find that upon being discharged from the service he had not been furnished with suitable equipment in the way of shoes. He had returned from overseas, where he served 9 or 10 months. He had worn there, of course, the heavy field shoes worn by those upon the battle front; he had no other shoes; and I was touched very much when he told me that when he was discharged he had only those field shoes, and that from the few dollars that he drew as his last payment from the Federal Government he had been required to expend seven or eight dollars for the purpose of purchasing shoes which were suitable to wear as he again returned to private life.

I think that when we consider the billions and billions of dollars that we have expended in connection with this war and the different steps that have been taken requiring the raising of revenue, and then consider that our success depended entirely upon our Army—that is, the ultimate success, because if we did not have these men who went to the front to do the fighting, then all of the other expenditures would have been useless and futile—we must come to the conclusion that as a recognition to our soldiers and in order that they may have a little pittance with which to attempt to rehabilitate and establish themselves in civil life, common justice and simple recognition of the performance of a patriotic, loyal, and heroic service not only justify but demand that the Congress of the United States adopt this amendment allowing these men this additional 60 days' pay.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], although I am frank to say that I would prefer to have had it proceed as a separate proposition, because I shall not be able to vote for this bill even with the amendment. Of course I realize that what the Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] has just said is true, that many of our young soldiers are coming home with practically no means whatever to maintain them until they can secure employment. Therefore I do not wish to be placed in the position of refusing to assist them to the extent provided by the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. But we can pass that kind of a provision here at any time without any difficulty whatever, in my judgment. I do not believe that it is necessary to tie it on to a proposition which otherwise is somewhat objectionable to me.

Mr. President, I listened with more than ordinary interest to the argument of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], recognizing in him, as I do, a man of sound judgment and high purpose in all matters of legislation. The grounds upon which he proposes to support this bill, as I understand them, are these: That it is calculated to stabilize social and industrial conditions in the countries where we desire to found a stable government in order that we may enter into the negotiation of treaties of peace with them.

There is an argument to be based upon those grounds that it is worthy of consideration. If I could have sufficient information as to how this desirable object was to be effectuated and some reasonable assurance that the desirable result would follow, I might be able to support the measure upon that ground alone. But I venture to say that neither the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] nor the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], who supported the bill upon yesterday, would be willing to invest a single dollar as a business proposition upon any such information as they have with reference to the manner in which this fund is to be applied, or as to the probable effect it will have if applied. What I object to, so far as that feature of the argument is concerned, is that we are legislating upon a mere sentimentality, without any practical facts to warrant the appropriation.

Mr. President, we are the only department of the Government that has the tremendous power to go into the pockets of the people and lift therefrom \$100,000,000. We are the only depart-

ment of the Government which has had conferred upon it that almost transcendent power, and we ought not to exercise it unless we can be advised of those concrete facts which justify the application of the principle. I have listened to the debate now for two days; and if there has been a single practical proposition enunciated or stated with reference to making effective this fund, or how it is to be done, where it is to be applied, and what is the probable machinery by which it is to be made effective, I have yet to hear it. It is a serious matter to appropriate \$100,000,000 in violation of the Constitution of the United States, at best, and certainly a strong and plain case ought to be made out.

Let me say to my able friend from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] that there is another side to this proposition of feeding men without any corresponding obligation upon their part to repay or to refund, or without any corresponding obligation upon their part to become individually liable for the amount which is donated to them. I read in the Washington Post of January 19, 1919, an article entitled "Belgians won't work." I shall not read the entire article, but I call attention to a single paragraph in it.

Another grave economic difficulty arises out of what is called the unemployment fund. This was created during the war to aid the workmen, employees, and others; to enable them to subsist without having to be dependent upon the Germans. In the first instance, the fund worked advantageously; but after a while a different state of things arose. A workman who was being fed gratuitously by the relief organization received from the unemployment fund regular pay of about 100 francs a month for doing nothing; and numbers of these workmen, well content with their lot, refused to return to work.

That is characteristic of the indiscriminate, ill-advised application of charitable funds. It is a very dangerous proposition, and unless the Congress can be advised in detail as to how this appropriation is to serve these people, and do them more good than harm, and how the fund is to be returned, and security had therefor, and obligations created therefor, it is a very dangerous scheme upon which we are now entering. Do Senators really think that the taxpayers of the United States ought to enter upon the boundless sea of feeding Europe without a detailed plan and chart and specifications as to how and where we are to apply it? Where will it all end?

Mr. President, what are the conditions which confront this country at this time? Now, let us not indulge in sensational matter but state the plain facts as they are. Is there a Senator here who does not receive daily any number of letters from the ordinary business men of this country telling us that they have about reached the end in business affairs—any number of them—advising you that they are borrowing money to pay their taxes at the present time, and that they are unable to see in the future any prospects of relief, in view of the things that Congress is doing and which it is promising to do? We know that these people throughout the United States feel—all men engaged in the ordinary occupations of life, in the ordinary business walks of life—that they have about reached the limit of their capacity to take care of this burden. I am perfectly aware that that does not apply to some business men in the country, who have been fortunate in making profits out of the war, but it does apply to the vast body of business men in the United States. And remember, my friends, that when you lay this burden of \$100,000,000 you lay it upon the man who is bearing all that he can possibly bear, as well as the man who is able to respond to it. It is not like going into a community and saying to Mr. Jones: "You are able to subscribe, and we ask you to exercise your charitable disposition toward the suffering people of Europe," and passing by the man who we know is unable to meet the obligations of his family and to discharge the duties of citizenship as they should be discharged in a Republic. We are now engaged in laying upon these people a burden of \$100,000,000 which will affect every citizen, if not in the actual payment of taxes, in raising the prices of the articles which he must buy; and therefore, without discrimination as to capacity to respond, this burden is being placed upon those who are able as well as those who are unable and unprepared to meet it.

That is the first situation which confronts us—that is to say, the taxes which are already extraordinarily heavy in this country.

Mr. President, this may not be an argument against doing charity, but I maintain that it is an argument in favor of the proposition of doing the charitable act in a most economical and businesslike way; that if it is going to be done, in view of the situation which confronts us, we must do it with due regard for economy and the saving of every possible dollar of expense to the taxpayer.

What is the second situation in this country? We know that already riotous meetings are being held in some parts of the country. In the city of Boston the other day—I believe the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] called attention to it—

we read that the city hall was stormed, and in the crowd were some 250 soldiers lately returned. We read in the Associated Press dispatch carried only five days ago from the city of New York that over 200,000 children in New York are underfed and underclothed; that in the city of Chicago more than 150,000 children are out of school because they have neither the food nor the clothes to go. We read in this same dispatch that in one little room 22 human beings were huddled together, and that they did not have, as the dispatch said, sufficient clothing upon them to warrant a second-hand clothes man in paying 13 cents for all that they wore. We know that throughout the country this feeling of unrest, of dissatisfaction with these conditions, is growing day by day.

Now, my friends, in dealing with this let us not forget the psychology of the hour through which we are passing. It is different from any confronting of labor difficulties which we have ever had before in this country. The great war has shaken society at the roots, and men will not go hungry and will not beg for bread with the same docility and regard for order that they have in previous days.

Again I say, Mr. President, it may not be an argument against charity to your neighbor; but it is the most solemn and convincing argument, to my mind, that if we are going to do it, it must be upon such practical plans and terms as will warrant you in saying to the people whom you represent that every precaution and safeguard has been had to protect the situation from waste and extravagance.

I shall not stop to read the articles to which I have referred, but, by permission of the Chair, I shall insert them in the body of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK.

Aroused by reports that, with Christmas approaching, East Side children are "fainting in school and dying at home from hunger" because their parents can not pay the prevailing high prices for milk and staple foods, representative citizens Saturday organized a committee to "feed them first and investigate afterwards."

A plea that something be done for her pupils, who were "slowly starving to death," was made recently by a teacher to Joseph S. Markus, a banker, who now heads the relief organization. Mr. Markus himself visited schools, hospitals, and tenements, and Saturday issued a statement dealing with conditions on the East Side.

HUNDREDS STARVING TO DEATH.

One settlement, he said, has the names of 150 babies who, recovering from influenza, now face death from pneumonia because their parents can not buy milk needed to restore them to health. Every hospital in the district, he continued, knows hundreds more underfed children, many of whom are physically unable to continue their studies. Of his visit to one school, he said:

"In one room there were 22 children. A ragman would not have paid 5 cents for all the clothing they wore. Many had no undergarments, and those who did could hardly call them by that name. Many were without shoes and others had heelless and solesless ones."

"We learned most of them came there without any breakfast. Some kind people were giving the teacher a little money every week, and with that she purchased some milk and cereals, preparing gruel over a small stove in the room. She said with the high cost of milk now she was not able to buy much, and that several of the children had fainted right in the classroom. Others were too weak to leave home and died there. Malnutrition was the cause—starvation."

Mr. BORAH. What is the third proposition, Mr. President? It is this question of expenditures, of extravagance. The able Senator who is in charge of this bill [Mr. MARTIN of Virginia] will sympathize with these remarks. No one has been more earnest and persistent in his efforts to curtail these extravagances, but they are here. They continue to grow. We have now entered upon the proposition not only of enlarging many expenditures which it seemed to me was unnecessary to enlarge, but, in the face of the condition which confronts the country, of raising salaries and enlarging the debt which we are gradually placing upon the people of this country in one way and another. The extravagance of the Government—and I say this regardless of the aisle which runs between the two parties—the extravagance of the Government at this time is something which is calculated to sterilize the industry and paralyze the initiative of business men throughout the entire land. Men hesitate to venture forth into new enterprises, or to put their money out into new industry, when they see the Congress of the United States shutting its eyes to the fact that they are already loaded down with debt, and still passing extravagant measures, larger and larger in amounts, and day by day.

After this comes what we are going to ask for the liberty loan, in a few days, six billions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, everything enjoins us when we propose to do this—if we are going to do it—to be sure that we are not making mistakes, if it is possible for human ingenuity to devise a plan by which no mistakes will be made.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] said yesterday that Mr. Hoover and the President were upon the ground, and

they knew. Of course I eliminate the President entirely from this discussion. The President practically eliminates himself, because he says, "I indorse the demands which Mr. Hoover is making upon the Congress"; and I say to you that the evidence is in existence, if it can all be secured, which will show that this plan for feeding Europe and the appropriation of a hundred million dollars, or some amount, originated before Mr. Hoover left for Europe.

It was not a scheme which had its birth after he discovered the facts in Europe. It was a scheme originated here, and he went to Europe to discover the facts after he had originated it. The evidence is in existence that this entire matter was talked over and arranged and provided for, one of the parties even stating that the probable amount was suggested which would be called for after Mr. Hoover had visited Europe.

Mr. President, I want to say again, as I said the other day, that as for Mr. Hoover individually I have no discussion whatever. I do not care anything about him. What I am objecting to, sir, is the system, the manner in which he distributes his funds and carries on his business—the interested parties whom he permits to realize unconscionable profits.

I want to ask Senators here who are supporting this bill, Do you want the same man that administered the Food Administration here in this country to administer this fund in Europe in the same way and upon the same principles? Do you understand, sir, that these same men, or some of them, and this same policy and this same system have been transplanted to Europe, and are now going to feed the Europeans upon the same theory, upon the same line of conduct, that they have administered the food administration in this country?

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] in his speech day before yesterday said, if I understood him correctly, that the meat packers of this country did business on less profit than any other of the large business institutions of the country. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] said that while their profits might be big, they only got about 2½ per cent upon a turnover. Well, Mr. President, a man operating in a monopolistic field may turn over his capital ten times without any risk whatever of losing anything; but what has that to do with the fact that after he has turned it over as often as he can, his profits are so enormous as to stagger even the most liberal in regard to such matters.

I want to read some figures which I did not have with me the other day, but which I have here now, and I do it because these are the sums which are made under the advice and by the consent and authority of the men who wish to administer this fund. I claim that when I go forth to do charity with another man's funds I should protect him to the extent of demanding not only honesty—and I am willing to concede that to Mr. Hoover—but a plan which will not permit, even under the cover of honesty, the gathering of unconscionable profits from a charity fund.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to recall to the mind of the Senator that during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt, and before the creation of the Department of Commerce, Mr. James R. Garfield, who was the Commissioner of Corporations, was assured by the packers that their profit upon their sales was something like 2 per cent or a little over, which Mr. Garfield accepted and announced to the country, all unconscious of the fact that the 2 or 2½ per cent represented merely a turnover, and, as the Senator says, these turnovers occur at the rate of 10 or 15 per year, the total annual profit, therefore, being many times the 2 or 2½ per cent represented to him.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator for that statement. It only shows the prolongation of the outrage that has long been practiced upon the American public.

Mr. President, in 1912 the five great packing companies realized in the way of profits \$18,715,000. In 1913 they realized \$20,217,000. Now, if I should say to you that these men demanded in the way of profits during the progress of this war twice the amount which they enjoyed in time of peace you would be inclined to think that they were rather exorbitant in their demands. No man ought to ask twice the profit in war that he was making in peace, when the profit which he was making in peace enabled him to gather a vast amount of wealth, as we know it had with the packers.

In 1912 and 1913 these great corporations were known as among the wealthiest in the world. They had extended their enterprise not only to the ramifications of the particular industry in which they originally started, but they had gone into a multitude of other industries; and they were considered, and

indeed were, among the wealthiest corporations in the United States, and were making and had gathered that wealth and realized this fund from profits which amounted to from \$18,000,000 to \$20,000,000 per annum. So, I say, that under those circumstances they ought to have been satisfied with their \$20,000,000. Do you not think so? When the soldier boys were being stood up in the camps, and it was demanded of them that they subscribe for liberty bonds in order to maintain the Government; when the employees in these different departments who were securing for their livelihood only about \$100 a month were called to the front by the head of the department and told that they must subscribe for liberty bonds; when local councils of national defense were calling men before them and fining them the amount which the council thought they should buy; when the soldiers were going forward at \$30 a month and enduring all kinds of hardships and sufferings for their country, ought not the packers to have been satisfied with twice their peace profits? But when I say to you that they were not satisfied with twice their peace profits, and when I call your attention to the fact that they made it three times, they made it four times, they made it five times the amount of their peace profits, will men still insist upon the floor of the Senate that we shall go down into the pockets of the taxpayers and administer charity under an organization which permits such profiteering?

That is what we are voting for here. This money will not administer itself. And take into consideration, my friends, that practically every dollar of the food which is purchased in this country is either owned or controlled or manipulated by these five great combinations, or the two other combinations which have had so much to do with the administration of the Food Administration.

So, sir, we find that these corporations in 1912 had a combined profit of \$18,715,000. In 1917 they had a combined profit of \$95,639,000. How did they get it? They got it under the administration of the Food Administration. Ninety-five million dollars; within \$5,000,000 of the amount which we are going to appropriate!

This is not a party question; but I want to say to the Republicans that the voters of this country may reflect that they made a mistake last November if we are going to return, like the sow to her wallow, and surrender to the same powers which once dictated the course of the Republican Party.

Let me read now from the figures of 1918. We have only one report thus far. This is from the Christian Science Monitor, a paper recognized for its accuracy in reference to its news items:

The earning power of the smallest of the American meat packers in the present period appears a subject of interest, for one thing because the greatest food distributors in the world to-day are, naturally, more than ever before in the public eye; and then, again, because this packer, the Cudahy Packing Co., is the first of the "big five" to report on the first year under Government profit regulation. By earning power is taken to mean the total earnings of the company, that figure which the Food Administration regulation was set to limit, that amount on which the Federal war tax will be levied. By earning power, in short, is meant, in this connection, the total profit the company made in its dealings with the public.

This earning power of the smallest of the packers was shown in a previous article on the Cudahy annual report in these columns (Dec. 20, 1918) to be larger for 1918 than ever before. Sales of the company also were much larger than in the previous history of the Cudahy Co.

Now, it may be of interest to measure this earning power of the smallest packer against the capital stock, to show what this earning power is equivalent to in terms of the common stock.

The total Cudahy profits, as represented in the term "earning power" as here used, may be assumed to have been \$6,000,000 in 1918. The company's net profit of \$3,376,808.58, plus its big reserve of \$2,785,412.78, set aside for "Federal income and war-profits taxes and contingencies," amounts to more than \$6,000,000, but that round figure may well be taken as representative of the year's total profits or the company's earning power. The capitalization is \$20,000,000, divided into \$2,000,000 of 6 per cent preferred, \$6,550,500 of 7 per cent preferred, and \$11,449,500 of common stock. After paying the regular dividends on the preferred stock the \$6,000,000 profit would represent an earning power of 47.4 per cent on the common stock.

Now, there were two stock dividends declared by the Cudahy Co. in the last three years prior to the end of the 1918 year. The first of these was in November of 1915, amounting to \$2,000,000. The second came a year later, amounting to \$2,724,750. Together they amounted to \$4,724,750. If these two stock dividends be subtracted from the total of the capital stock, which, of course, they helped to bring to its present figure, this leaves a balance of common stock of \$6,724,750. If the 1918 earning power of the company, namely, at the rate of \$6,000,000, were to be computed on the common stock remaining after that portion representative of stock dividends were deducted, it would be equivalent to an earning power of 80 per cent.

Should it be remarked that it is unusual to compute earning power in the sense used against the common stock, because the common stock does not share in such earning power, but only in what remains after Federal taxes are paid, which makes a large deduction from gross earnings, it may be said that this is perfectly true as far as the stockholders are concerned, but the public may nevertheless be interested in such a comparison. Up to the last few years there were no large Federal taxes to make such deductions, and it is possible that within a few years more Federal taxes may be much smaller, in which case that much more of the total profits will go to the stockholders. The public, so students of the packing industry here pointed out, is naturally interested in the total profits packers make and what they may represent as measures

against the ownership of the company, because the public makes those profits possible; because, one of these students has put it, "the consuming power of the public is the vital breath of this and every other great corporation."

As to what stockholders do get, after the big tax reserve has been subtracted from profits, leaving net profits of \$3,376,808.58 to be computed against the capital stock, the rate of earnings on the common stock is 24.44 per cent.

Then, again, as to the deduction of the amount of stock dividends from the total of common stock and the calculation of rate of return on the remainder. Stock dividends have been a favorite device of big corporations to make their profit look small, and a word in general about the usual packer stock dividends will perhaps not be amiss.

A stock dividend represents capitalized profits. It represents money made by the company, over and above cash dividends paid, which remains in the business in the form of surplus, and of which stockholders are given ownership through the issue of so much new stock free to them. This new stock, of course, increases the company capitalization by that much. Since a concern's rate of earning is based on the company's capitalization, particularly on its common stock, given a fixed amount of profits, the rate of earning will appear high or low, according as the amount of the common stock is small or great. For instance, Morris & Co., another of the packers, still retains a capitalization of \$3,000,000, though the business is worth many millions more than that, and the company is considerably larger than the Cudahy company. If Morris & Co. made no more profit than Cudahy did in 1918, still it would show more than 100 per cent profit on its capital stock, though the smaller Cudahy company, with a larger capital stock, evidences a very much smaller rate of earnings. Hence a stock dividend, by enlarging the amount of the divisor in the fraction, to wit, the capitalization, may have a decided influence on the aspect of profits.

If the two stock dividends of the Cudahy Co. previously referred to be deducted from the common stock, and the rate of return to stockholders is calculated on the basis of the 1918 "net profits"—that is to say, \$3,376,808.58, the amount available for dividends and surplus after provision was made for war taxes, etc.—it is noted to be 41 per cent. The rate of return on the common, without the stock dividend deduction, has already been observed as 24.44 per cent.

Not every stock dividend may be subject to criticism, as, for instance, where a concern has been making reasonable profits and turning back a portion of them into the business, eventually to set up this portion of past reasonable profits into common stock. In the case of several of the meat-packer stock dividends and of the Standard Oil stock dividends, there has been a suspicion on the part of the public that the profit there reposing represented, in the aggregate, an undue amount.

The Cudahy Co. in 1918 showed the largest earning power, as heretofore defined, in its history. Its net profits were larger than in any previous year with the exception of 1917. The company has had some hard sledding in several past years. The Cudahy profit figures are of interest, now and for the future, in the view of local students of the industry, in regard to the Cudahy Co., and more particularly in regard to the earnings of the leaders of the "big five," whose sales and profits run much higher, indeed, than those of the last of the quintet.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to suggest to the Senator, in reference to the Christian Science Monitor and these figures, that the testimony before the Agricultural Committee shows that the packers are spending \$1,000,000 a month advertising in the papers of the country, a large part of it being advertisements of their small profits, but the Christian Science Monitor does not receive these advertisements, I understand.

Mr. BORAH. I thank the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, I come to another feature of this administration. I read from a letter from Alfred H. Benjamin, of New York, under the date of January 20, 1919. He says:

I represent one of the largest independent packers, operating plants in Argentina and Uruguay during the last 20 years, who have no interest at all with the Chicago packers.

We have been very important factors in reducing the cost of living in this country at a time when it was badly needed. We have been the largest importers of fats for the independent soap makers of this country, but owing to an embargo that was placed into effect on the 13th of May we were precluded from bringing in such fats as required by the soap makers, on a statement of the Food Administration that there was ample fat in the country. Notwithstanding the appeals of the independent soap makers of this country, this embargo was kept on.

In the meantime the market advanced 25 per cent and the Chicago packers had ample opportunity of selling their tallow at the record prices of 20 to 20½ cents per pound. As soon as the embargo was removed the market broke to 10 cents per pound.

Mr. President, the men who manipulated that embargo are working for the Food Administration at a dollar a year and working for the packers at \$10,000 a year; and yet you ask me to take \$100,000,000 from the pockets of the taxpayers of this country and administer it by the same infamous machinery. Does the President of the United States know these facts? I do not know. I know them, and it is my conscience that must be satisfied, not that of the President, in the vote I shall cast on this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to ask the Senator whether the figures and the statistics from the Christian Science Monitor differ from the statement given in Document No. 248, at page 14, by the Federal Trade Commission with reference to the packing industry and their net profits? If the Senator has not access to that document—

Mr. BORAH. I have it, but I could not from memory now compare the figures.

Mr. FLETCHER. In this document the Federal Trade Commission say:

An exposition of the excess profits of four of the big meat packers (Armour, Swift, Morris, Cudahy, omitting Wilson as not comparable) is given in the fact that their aggregate average prewar profit (1912, 1913, and 1914) was \$19,000,000; that in 1915 they earned \$17,000,000 excess profits over the prewar period; in 1916, \$36,000,000 more profit than in the prewar period; and in 1917, \$68,000,000 more profit than in the prewar period. In the three war years from 1915 to 1917 their total profits have reached the astounding figure of \$140,000,000, of which \$121,000,000 represents excess over their prewar profits.

I believe that statement has been challenged, but I do not know whether the Senator has taken the trouble to verify it or not.

Mr. BORAH. I could not say as to whether those figures have been verified. I thank the Senator from Florida for putting them in the RECORD.

Mr. President, may I read another statement? I read from the testimony before the Agricultural Committee on the 18th day of January, 1919. This is the statement of the attorney who was selected by the President to investigate the condition with reference to the packers. It has not been controverted that I know of, and I presume it was under oath and the witness would be responsible. I am not certain as to its being under oath. I simply call attention to that as an incident. Mr. Heney said:

Mr. HENEY. I am telling you all that I know about it, Senator.

Along in March I was in Washington. I was summoned here by the Federal Trade Commission because I had been making public some correspondence from Swift's files, which showed that Swift had packed the Food Administration in its own interests in the Council of Defense. They had Mr. Heyl, who was the head of Libby, McNeill & Libby, which was owned by Swift & Co. Mr. Heyl was in the Food Administration directing the regulation and fixing the prices for canned goods, and canned vegetables had been under his particular direction with Libby, McNeill & Libby.

Mr. Collins, one of the most important men in Swift & Co.'s organization, was here with the Food Administration also. They were drawing a dollar a year from the Government, and Collins was drawing \$10,000 from Swift & Co., and Heyl was drawing, I think, \$10,000—I have forgotten the exact figures—from Libby, McNeill & Libby.

Senator NORRIS. They were with the Food Administration?

Mr. HENEY. In the Food Administration. And Priebe, of Priebe & Co., Chicago, was with the Food Administration in charge of the fixing of prices and regulations for poultry, and I think he included eggs and cheese and butter, but at any rate poultry. I am not at all certain that he had anything but poultry. I rather think it was poultry, although it may have included the other things.

I was furnished correspondence that showed that Priebe—let me go back a moment—I received complaints from small poultry concerns all over the country to the effect that Priebe was using his position to enable Swift & Co. to monopolize the poultry market and in doing so was forcing a loss upon the small poultry dealers, and they based that upon the proposition that about the middle of September, 1917, Priebe had issued an order that all poultry must be out of cold storage by December 1 of that year.

Do you know who gave Mr. Priebe authority to issue that order? The Congress of the United States by one of those glittering generalities crystallized into a statute under which a man can do anything in the world that he desires to do, and Mr. Hoover desired to do this. Now we are asked to give another unlimited, undefined grant of power—a power to do as his unbridled discretion suggests; a power under which he can permit fortunes to be made again out of the taxpayers of the United States.

They explained to me that the poultry pack of 1916, which commenced to come in in September, 1916, and to be packed, Swift & Co. disposed of practically all their holdings, and Swift & Co. are probably the largest dealers in poultry in the United States, in frozen poultry, cold-storage poultry. And Priebe handled that department for them—

Mr. Priebe handled that department for them, exercising the powers of the Government, issuing orders like a dictator, fixing embargoes, and turning loose cold-storage products according to the interests of his master. Dost thou like the picture? Are you so proud of what you have already permitted that you want to see it repeated, and repeated by your authority? Are you going to indorse such practices by your votes—

under the name of Priebe & Co., a separate corporation, but the entire 100 per cent of the stock is owned by Swift & Co.

The claim was that Priebe and Swift & Co. had disposed of all the poultry; that the fresh poultry was just about to commence coming in; that Swift & Co. wanted to capture the greatest part of the pack; that it wanted to get them for lower prices than it could get them if the poultry in cold storage was not thrown on the market, and by forcing this poultry on the market it would immediately depress prices so that Swift & Co. could buy the largest part of this pack at a much lower price than it otherwise could; and that Priebe, in order to accomplish this, had put out an order that the banks should not loan over 70 per cent of the cost prices of these turkeys.

War Power? War powers used to destroy competitors and build up private fortunes. No man who has such perverted views of decency ought to be entrusted with unlimited power to deal with \$100,000,000.

Senator NORRIS. He was doing that as an official of the Food Administration?

Mr. HENRY. As an official of the Food Administration. And then they came to me—

Senator KENYON. Was he at that time drawing this dollar a year here and \$10,000 there?

Mr. HENRY. He was not drawing \$10,000—that was Collins. Priebe was drawing \$275 from Priebe & Co. and 25 per cent of the net profits of Priebe & Co., after 7 per cent had been paid on the capital stock.

Senator NORRIS. He was doing that while representing the Food Administration?

Senator KENYON. He was getting a dollar a year here, was he not?

Mr. HENRY. He was getting a dollar a year here. And that Priebe & Co. had disposed of their stock—one minute—that the banks should not loan over 10 per cent, yet there is testimony that many of the banks had loaned customers who had good credit 100 per cent on the poultry they had put in storage that preceding year.

It seems that the large packers had made a good deal of money in the poultry business the preceding year; and so the small dealers had all plunged a little on poultry that year and there was such a demand for poultry that Swift & Co. wanted to secure this pack, as much of it as it could, and at as low a price as possible.

So, on account of this order, there was great complaint, of course, made, and finally the time was extended some. But on this order that the poultry should go out of cold storage on September 1, the dealers held back on buying stocks of poultry, and naturally. So that the smaller dealers who had poultry had to get rid of it as fast as they could, and not only did it depress prices somewhat, but Swift & Co. bought up a considerable part, as shown by the testimony, of the pack of the poultry held by small dealers whenever they put it out, besides buying the greater part of the new pack as it came in.

Of course, Armour bought heavily also.

Then he describes a convention of poultry men at Kansas City in which Swift & Co. ran the convention. It throws some light on the subject, and reads as follows:

A convention of poultry dealers took place in Missouri, in Kansas City, shortly after I commenced putting out these letters publicly in Chicago. And, by the way, I put out a letter that showed how Heyl came to get into the Food Administration and how Louis Swift and the other Swifts were very active in the matter of helping him to get there, and how a man named Brooks, of Swift & Co., wrote a letter to Swift telling him how his friend Chambers was to come on here and be in charge of shipments on the railroads. He is a Santa Fe Railroad man, and Chambers was the best friend that he had in the world, and Chambers had told him that when their interests came up they could rely on him to the limit. Of course, the Santa Fe was undoubtedly anxious to have the good will of Swift & Co., who are such heavy shippers; and shortly after Chambers got here he managed it so that the Food Administration, through Mr. Hoover, asked Swift & Co. to please loan them Mr. Brooks, so that Mr. Brooks came and got on the job himself. He was one of the dollar-a-year men, I think; I am not sure about his being a dollar-a-year man.

Senator NORRIS. You mean that you are not sure he got a dollar a year?

Mr. HENRY. No; I mean that he got a little more than that.

Senator NORRIS. He may have done it for nothing?

Mr. HENRY. He may have got a little more.

So at this poultry dealers' meeting, or convention, in Kansas City a man named Lightfoot, who is in the poultry business in Missouri and has some thirty odd plants, a very successful man, one of the most aggressive of the smaller dealers, and who tells me that Swift & Co. told him in 1905 that they were going to put him out of business if he did not sell out to them or come under their control, at the same time they told it to Priebe, and that they did put Priebe out of business in 1905—they told him prior to 1905—and he went into insolvency or bankruptcy or something of the sort. They then acquired Priebe & Co., and then employed Priebe, and he had been running that ever since, and making large profits for Swift & Co. under this arrangement now, as I told you, of \$275 a month and 25 per cent on the net profits after 7 per cent had been paid on the capital.

Senator KENYON. And then the dollar a year more here?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; and then the additional dollar a year here.

Lightfoot said that what he objected to most strongly was that Priebe was demanding that these dealers should make a statement each month telling exactly how much poultry he had bought, and from whom he bought it, the price he paid, et cetera; and Lightfoot said he had succeeded in maintaining himself against Swift & Co.'s attempt to put him out of business all these years, but, with the knowledge that Priebe would have if he answered those inquiries of the Food Administration—made those reports each month—that, of course, Swift & Co. could put him out of business as soon as the war was over; that if they were to give him—Lightfoot—the same information about Swift & Co.'s business that they were attempting to get about his, that he would guarantee that he could come pretty near taking away a large part of the business of Swift & Co.; that if he could get the financial backing he could take it all away in that particular line.

Lightfoot went to a hearing of these poultry dealers—I had not seen him up to that time—at Kansas City and he introduced a resolution condemning Priebe and calling for his removal.

Senator KENYON. Asking for his removal from the Food Administration?

Mr. HENRY. Yes. And Mr. Hoover had been invited to go to Kansas City and address this convention, and he had sent Priebe there as his representative; and Lightfoot did not want to take any snap judgment—throw him out on one morning of the convention—that he intended to introduce this resolution on the following morning and press it to a vote, Mr. Priebe being there. Mr. Lightfoot made a talk in support of his motion and attacked Mr. Priebe in Priebe's presence, and accused him of using his position for the purpose of destroying the smaller dealers, of injuring their business, and aiding Swift & Co. to accomplish the monopolization of these things, and challenged Mr. Priebe to reply to it. But Mr. Priebe did not reply. And that night Lightfoot and a lot of others who were there told me the Kansas delegates were busy running around seeing everybody, sending them to vote against the resolution, insisting that they had invited Mr. Hoover there, and he had sent Mr. Priebe as his representative, and that it would not do to slap him in the face then; that if this was true, that was not the time to do it; and many of the dealers on that ground, or the representatives of the dealers on that ground, agreed to vote against it.

In addition to that, the big packers brought in 20 or 30 or more, as I recall it now, men who were under their influence—dealers, and some

of their own employees—and had them pay in the \$5, I think it was, initiation fee in order to be able to vote that morning; and the resolution came very near passing. I have forgotten the number of votes, but it was quite small, which it was defeated by.

And then Mr. Lightfoot after that got in communication with me. I was then in Chicago, holding these meetings and putting this correspondence forth.

When I got here to Washington on the summons of the Federal Trade Commission I was told that Mr. Hoover had complained to the President that the publication of these letters was impairing his influence and not getting the country to save food, etc., and that it ought to be stopped.

While I was here, or a day or two afterwards, Heyl resigned from the canned-goods division of the Food Administration.

Senator KENYON. Which one of the commissioners of the Federal Trade Commission took it up with you?

Mr. HENRY. All of them.

Senator KENYON. At a meeting?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; at a meeting.

Senator NORRIS. Did they order you to drop that?

Mr. HENRY. No. It seems that Mr. Hoover had gone to the President and that the President sent word over to them that he had no instructions to give in the matter, but he hoped a head-on collision could be avoided; that was the way it was put up to me.

So they wanted to know if I would talk with Mr. Hoover, and I said that I would—in their presence; and so an appointment was made, and Mr. Hoover came over and brought his attorney with him.

Senator KENYON. Who was that?

Mr. HENRY. I have forgotten his name. I think he is a Philadelphia man.

Senator KENYON. Was it Glasgow?

Mr. HENRY. Is that the name?

Senator KENYON. Yes.

Mr. HENRY. I told Mr. Hoover I thought that Priebe should be removed, and he said that he was satisfied that Mr. Priebe was absolutely all right; that Mr. Priebe had severed his connection with Swift & Co.; that he had an interest in four other concerns which had no connection whatever with Swift & Co.; that he was no longer drawing any salary from Priebe & Co., and the salary there was the smallest part of it, because he was getting 25 per cent of the net profits, which were quite large, after the 7 per cent had been paid on the capital.

Senator GROOM. Did Mr. Hoover know that these other men—Heyl and Collins and possibly Brooks—were getting large salaries from the packers?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; because I brought that out at the public hearing in Chicago before this, Senator, and that was what brought about this condition that sent Mr. Hoover over to the President. He then told me, too, that Mr. Hoover had been indorsed by a convention in Kansas City as to his actions; as I recall it, he said "unanimously."

Senator KENYON. You mean Mr. Priebe?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Priebe, I should say. At that time I did not know about the action of that convention, and that is the action I have been just telling you about.

I went back and investigated that, and I sent for Mr. Lightfoot to get the story, and I also took it up with Mr. Seymour Newman, who is the editor of the Chicago Produce News, and I found that the Chicago Produce News and a paper over in New York owned by the same man—not by Newman; Newman's employee, editor and manager at Chicago; this man's name I have forgotten, but he has a produce paper in New York—that he had been threatened for publishing editorials. He had been publishing editorials demanding that Priebe be removed and accusing Priebe of these things, and he had been threatened—a man had come over there from the Food Administration and said that his paper would be refused admission to the mails if he continued. I have learned that through his representative in Chicago.

Senator KENYON. How could the Food Administration deny the mails to a publisher?

Mr. HENRY. They were going to have it done through Burleson, under that law.

Senator KENYON. This messenger was not from Burleson's office?

Mr. HENRY. No. I happen to know who he was. It was Mr. Powell, of California, who was with the Food Administration.

I wrote a letter then to the owner of the paper, and Newman did not want me to—well, I wrote a letter to the owner of the paper in New York and told him that Newman had told me that he had been approached, and asked him who approached him, and what was said, and said that if he would write me frankly and fully I would present the matter to the President; that I was satisfied that the President would not tolerate any such bulldozing to prevent a man from expressing his convictions in regard to a matter of this kind. I got a reply from him, but he did not tell me—but in the meanwhile he wrote an editorial taking back what he said about Priebe.

In this talk with Mr. Hoover I was asked if it was necessary—Hoover said all he wanted to know was that a man was crooked or not the right man for the place, and he would put him out immediately, but that he knew these other facts about Priebe. I said, "Mr. Hoover, I do not question your integrity one iota, but I do question your viewpoint not only in this matter but others," and I had in mind Joe Cotton. I questioned it very seriously, and I say Priebe is not fit for the job, and that Swift & Co. are interested in these other matters—business firms that he claims that he is interested in—

Senator KENYON (interposing). Is this Cotton the Wall Street lawyer?

Mr. HENRY. Yes. He had charge of the regulations of the packers, and whom I believe to be a man of the highest integrity but absolutely unfit, because of his viewpoint and environment, to have anything to do with regulating the packers; and that was demonstrated by the result of his regulation. I understand that he testified before a committee of the Senate that the regulations had cut the profits of the packers in half, and weeks later he got a report from the rate expert on the books, the checks of those 20 weeks' period, and the result showed that all of the packers but one were making more money up to that time, under the regulations, than they had made in 1917, and he had personally told me—Cotton had—that the profits in 1917 were "scandalous" and could not be described by any other term.

Now, I ask you from all these facts who ran the Food Administration? I ask you how and by whose consent these great profits were made? It was by consent of the Food Administration, under authority assumed by reason of the general terms of a law we passed. Shall we go further in this affair?

Mr. President, this of itself precludes my giving my vote for this bill. This same organization, these same representatives, this same system has been transferred to Europe, and they are now there to administer a charity fund made up by the taxpayers of the United States. The only people with whom they will have to deal in the purchase are the people with whom they have been dealing for the last year and a half. The people who are fixing the prices now are the people who have been fixing them for the last year and a half, and the people who will administer the fund are the same people who have been administering it for the last year and a half.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GAY in the chair.) Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KENYON. I know the Senator wants to be accurate, and I call his attention to the fact that they are not exactly the same people. They are not all there. Mr. Thomas Logan, who was on a salary of the packers, maintaining an expensive suite here at the Willard Hotel, and also employed by the Standard Oil Co. and other corporations and running a bureau contributing to papers and magazines, went over with Mr. Hoover and Mr. Hurley, sat in all the conferences with them, discussing the food situation at a time when he was an employee of the packers. He has returned, so that the Senator is not exactly accurate in saying that all are there.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no doubt that the cables will be open to Mr. Logan in case his advice becomes necessary in Europe.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the Senator a question before he closes his remarks?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. CURTIS. I understood the Senator to say a few moments ago that there was an understanding before Mr. Hoover went abroad that this money would be asked for, and that he went abroad to gather the facts to justify asking for it. Will the Senator give us his authority for that statement?

Mr. BORAH. I do not want to take the time to read it, but I will insert it in the RECORD. If the Senator will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 20, 1919, on page 1746, he will find what I had reference to.

Mr. CURTIS. In whose speech is it?

Mr. BORAH. It is in the testimony of Mr. Taliaferro before the Agricultural Committee. The Senator will find that Mr. Taliaferro states that the packers and Mr. Hoover talked over the matter of finding a market or stabilizing prices for their reservoirs of food supplies in this country, that the subject matter was discussed, and he states plainly, it seems to me, that it was understood that the market was to be found in the European situation, and that the matter was discussed in its fullness before Mr. Hoover went to Europe at all. I can not construe it any other way.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. Will the Senator from Idaho go a step further and tell us whether during that conversation there was a discussion or an understanding that an appropriation of this character was to be asked for in order to make that market? I think it raises an extremely important and interesting question here.

Mr. KENYON. I can assist the Senator, I think, about that.

Mr. BORAH. I would be very glad to have the Senator's suggestion. I will look for the specific statement. It is here.

Mr. KENYON. I do not think the specific statement is there, but at the conference there was an agreement that this appropriation should be asked. The situation was this, according to the witnesses: Britain had ceased to buy pork products. The packers either sought a meeting with Mr. Hoover or he called them here in October, some 25 or 30 of them, including the witness. The whole situation was talked over, and the question of stabilizing the prices was discussed, so that there would be no loss to the packers, and keeping, rather, an agreement of honor that had been made between the Food Administration and the packers as to keeping up prices under the arrangements which had theretofore been made. The witness said he did not know at that time that Mr. Hoover was going to Europe, but that Mr. Hoover had now gone there, and he expected him to carry out the understanding of that meeting. That is the substance of his testimony.

Mr. BORAH. I will read from Mr. Taliaferro's testimony:

Mr. TALIAFERRO. So far I have no objections. If the present price is maintained and there are not sufficiency of orders forthcoming the packers are going to be compelled to stand the biggest loss, in my esti-

mation, that they ever stood, and probably a great many of them will be seriously crippled.

Senator KENYON. Just what do you mean by that? Are there great quantities of meat products in the cold-storage houses now?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. At the present time the products, while ample, are pretty well taken care of by allied orders.

Senator GRONNA. In reality, there is an oversupply of meats at the present time?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. There is an oversupply immediately available for the amount of consumption that is apparent.

Senator KENYON. And if we do not get rid of that oversupply the packers are going to be in a bad way?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. They are going to be compelled to stop. We are only operating in one door and carrying it out the other. If any links of that chain is broken, the weakest one, the whole thing stops.

Senator GRONNA. Has that oversupply caused any change in prices?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Has it made any change in prices?

Senator GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. TALIAFERRO. Not yet, Senator; but it is likely to make an awful change in prices if the outlet is stopped. If you dam the river up at its outlet instead of its source, you are going to have trouble.

The CHAIRMAN. You figure if this meat can be used and disposed of to the southeastern Europeans that that demand will relieve this congestion of meat and it will enable the packers to keep running and supply the demand for fresh meat in England?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It will; that is the secret of the whole thing. Senator, that the continuity of events must not be interrupted in any one particular, not from the producer on the farms to the consumer in Europe.

Senator KENYON. If they did not get the consumer in Europe and these products were thrown upon the market the consumer would get meat a little cheaper, would he not?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. He certainly would.

Senator KENYON. But you think it would make a smash among the packers?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It would make a smash among the producers and packers, too.

Senator KENYON. Both together?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. You can not pare that potato without taking off something from each fellow. Everyone will have to suffer if that happens. The apparent suffering will be, of course, on the man who owns the biggest amount of product, which will be the packer. The packer has no guaranty that this stuff he is paying 17½ cents for is going to be taken off his hands. There is no guaranty. The Food Administration has not given us a guaranty on that. They have just told us, "Go ahead. You are a patriotic bunch of fellows, and pack these hogs on the basis of 17½, and we are going to get orders for you." But they do not give us any insurance policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hoover was instrumental in giving those assurances?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I want to say one thing for Mr. Hoover; that I have been under him—in connection with the license—and I have seen that gentleman under the most adverse circumstances, the most trying circumstances, and I want to say that he is one of the grandest men I know of; that he has done more good to the producers of this country than any other man in the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The packers pretty generally agree in that opinion?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I do not know. They know worth when they see it.

Senator KENYON. Was meat and money the only things he talked over with the packers?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It has all been a matter of our risking our money against their promise of their ability to relieve us of the product.

Senator KENYON. Do you not think, now, with Mr. Hoover over there insisting on this \$100,000,000, that he is keeping faith with you?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I certainly do, or I would not be buying hogs; and I will go the limit on what he says, and that is the reason I am spending my good money on hogs. I know I will lose a lot of money on it if anything should slip.

I also insert in this connection the statement of Glasgow, representative of the Food Administration, in testimony before the House committee on this bill:

We also at this time, because of the stimulation of the production of hogs throughout the hog-producing sections of the country, have accumulated in the hands of the packers, by reason of the run on hogs at this particular time of the year, a large surplus that we must work off as we can to Europe, and one of the purposes of Mr. Hoover has been, if possible, to provide a safe and regular drain of such edibles as fats, oils, and cereals that we have a surplus of to Europe, with due regard to protecting our own population by holding control over the export of them.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I attach so much importance to the judgment of the Senator from Idaho that I want to be perfectly clear about it, if he is willing to make himself a little more clear. The impression that I received from his statement was that it had been prearranged that this \$100,000,000 appropriation should be asked for in order to relieve the packers. I have heard here on the floor of the Senate that we should appropriate this money because of the sending of this cablegram from the President to the Acting Secretary of State, in which he points out the distress and hunger which exists in various sections of Europe and particularly among the urban population, and asks for money to be expended by him as he shall see fit, and where he sees fit to expend it. Those are two entirely different propositions. I would never in the world vote for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to enable Mr. Hoover to stabilize packing products in Europe by virtue of a preconceived arrangement. I might, in connecting the situation in Europe with the war, be persuaded to vote for the appropriation upon the theory the President puts it. I would like to know what is the deliberate judgment of the Senator from Idaho upon those two propositions?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Pennsylvania is an able lawyer and a sound judge of evidence. Let us review briefly,

therefore, the facts and circumstances which warrant the conclusion I have drawn. First, let it be remembered that men in the employ of the packers, drawing large salaries from the packers, were in control of matters in the Food Administration having particularly to do with the packers' interest; that upon the signing of the armistice the packers were left with a large food supply on hand which they had acquired during the war; that if a market was not found for this food they stood to lose a large sum of money, as prices would fall and they would have to sell on a falling market; that the point, therefore, was to find a market and thereby stabilize prices, and in this the packers were supremely interested; to this end a conference was called between the packers and Mr. Hoover, and the entire subject matter was discussed, although we have not the details as fully as we should like; shortly after the conference the newspapers carried the statement that Mr. Hoover was going to Europe to look after the food situation and might become the food dictator of Europe; that on this trip to Europe with Hoover, sitting in with him and advising about the situation, were men in the pay of the packers; that within less than a week after Mr. Hoover arrived in Europe, and before he could have surveyed the situation, before he had been outside of Paris or London, the newspapers carried back here, in substance, his plan; then came his demand for a hundred million dollars; this was followed by a telegram from Mr. White, a member of the peace commission, urging a hundred million dollars more and referring to the fact that we had large food reservoirs in this country, the prices for which should be stabilized; that afterwards Mr. Glasgow, representative of the Food Administration, stated specifically that the packers had accumulated large supplies of pork, and that it was necessary to work this off as we could to Europe, and that that was one of Mr. Hoover's purposes; that Mr. Taliaferro, representative of the packers, testified before the committee that in demanding this hundred million Hoover was simply keeping good faith with the packers, or, in other words, carrying out the understanding, express or implied. Add to this the fact that we went in search of an opportunity to expend this money, and did not wait for the petitions or pleas to come from the distracted countries. Others may take what view they will; I can not close my eyes to such a set of facts, to my mind intolerable and indefensible.

Mr. KNOX. Can the Senator from Idaho tell me whether or not it is the same evidence upon which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Gore] made the statement day before yesterday that a part of this money was to be used for this purpose?

Mr. BORAH. It is part of the same evidence.

Mr. President, I can not recall the witness's name, because I am not a member of the committee, but there was a witness who appeared before the House committee several weeks ago and testified with reference to this reservoir of foodstuffs which are on hand. I can not recall the witness's name, but as to the necessity of taking care of it and to avoid loss upon the part of the packers—

Mr. KNOX. To what Mr. White did the Senator refer?

Mr. BORAH. I referred to Mr. White, the member of the peace commission.

Mr. KNOX. Can the Senator indicate where that cablegram can be found?

Mr. KENYON. I will say that it can be found in the House hearings. It is the cablegram to Senator Lodge. It is not all there, but the portion the Senator from Idaho referred to is there.

Mr. SMOOT. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator speaks of the food reservoir, and from his remarks I judge that the food in that reservoir in France belongs to the packers. Am I correct in that?

Mr. BORAH. In France?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know where it is located. It is supposed to belong to the packers wherever it is located.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator that from all the testimony we have had that I have heard the food products in France that are to be drawn from belong to the United States. The packers have been paid for every pound of it, and it is there now in great quantities. It was sent there for the purpose of feeding the Army, thinking that the war would go on for months and months longer. The selling of that product can not give the packers any benefit whatever.

Mr. BORAH. Neither is it necessary to appropriate \$100,000,000 to get it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is another question. All I wanted to know was whether the packers had over there products which

were not sold and paid for. In that case I certainly would not vote a single dollar to purchase the products of the packers that were over there and not liable to be used because of the Army returning home. But I understand the Government of the United States has paid for every pound of meat products, and every pound that is now in France has been purchased from the packers.

Mr. BORAH. That may be true, but we are not appropriating \$100,000,000 to get that food supply.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say, if I understand the situation aright, the food supply is to be bought by a portion of this appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Bought of the United States?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; not only the food supply we have in France, but the millions of suits of clothing and all the acres and tens of acres of trucks and automobiles.

Mr. BORAH. You are not going to feed those to the Bolsheviks?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but I will say to the Senator that those things are there, and they are to be sold by the United States.

Mr. BORAH. But that has nothing to do with this fund whatever. Let us not mix up automobiles and trucks with pork.

Mr. SMOOT. I will simply say that we have pork there in great quantities. We shipped over 2,500,000,000 tons of beef for the feeding of our Army. We have lard and lard products in large quantities, and we have all manner of food provisions there for the Army. They are not to be used, and can not be used, by the time the Army is supposed to leave France, and they have got to be sold. Whether they are sold for this purpose or some other purpose, they have to be sold, and whatever we get out of them, of course, will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I might inquire—

Mr. BORAH. I shall yield in just a moment. I desire to ask the Senator from Utah what construction he places upon this:

Mr. TALIAFERRO. It has all been a matter of our risking our money. Senator KENYON. Do you think now, with Mr. Hoover over there insisting upon this \$100,000,000 appropriation, that he is keeping faith with you?

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I certainly do.

What construction does the Senator from Utah place upon that?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was not discussing the question as to whether or not they had an agreement. I asked the Senator the question if he knew whether the packers had any meat products over in France that were unsold? I understand they had no reservoir of food in France, and that the only meat products in France, which are held in any quantities at all, are either owned by our own Government or by the English Government or by the French Government.

Mr. BORAH. That is veering away from the proposition which I was discussing. I say that the evidence is ample to satisfy any reasonable mind that this plan to appropriate money to feed the people of Europe resulted from an interview and conference with the packers of this country who wanted to get rid of their extraordinary food supplies that were on hand.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does not the Senator from Idaho see that exactly the same result would be accomplished; that is, the maintenance of the prices of foodstuffs? Suppose the Government has—that seems to be a disputed matter, but the papers have so stated it—\$55,000,000 worth of foodstuffs in Europe; suppose it belongs to the Government, and we take \$55,000,000 of this appropriation and pay it back to the Government for the food we already have there at those prices, the result is just the same; the prices are maintained, and the packers are benefited accordingly, although in that event the bill ought to be changed so that it would simply be a donation of this food which we have accumulated instead of an appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I do not see any reason for appropriating \$100,000,000 and taking it out of the pocket of Paul and putting it in the pocket of Peter.

Mr. CUMMINS. I intend to discuss that phase of the matter presently, when we reach it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state the only reason for that. Suppose this Government, if we pass this bill, appropriates \$100,000,000 and it is distinctly understood that England, France, and Italy will make an appropriation of \$200,000,000 more, so that the fund will be \$300,000,000; then whatever products are purchased will be purchased out of that fund as a whole, whether it is purchased of England, of France, or of the United

States. That is the only reason I can see for making an appropriation of money rather than a direct appropriation of the products themselves.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, all this is getting away from the proposition that I do not want forgotten and the proposition which I have stated.

Mr. President, I would not be so absolutely certain of this proposition—although the evidence was in my possession when I spoke the other day, but it was in my possession in such a way that I was under obligation not to use it, and the only reason I feel justified in using it to-day is because Mr. Taliaferro let the cat out of the sack—if the evidence were not in existence; but it can be had, and, in my judgment, before the committee gets through it will be beyond peradventure. I do not propose, sir, to cast my vote even when there is a well-founded doubt.

If there is a way to administer this fund beyond question, so that it will be administered straight and clean and to the best interests of the taxpayers of the United States, why, in the name of justice, should men under their oath take a chance in administering a trust fund? Would you do it with your business affairs? If you were standing here as a guardian of a trust fund, would you for a moment undertake to have it administered with such facts as these staring you in the face by such a machinery as that? And you should be 10 times more careful with a trust fund which may cause trouble in this country before we are through.

Passing a hundred million dollar appropriation upon a telegram! There is no more determination in the mind of Mr. Hoover since he visited the depopulated and crushed people of Europe to feed them than there was when he left here. He is not any more convinced now than he was when he took boat from New York that it would be necessary to do so.

Why did not we wait until the cry from Macedonia came to us? Where are the people of Europe who have petitioned the people of the United States for charity? Where is the supplication? It did not originate in Europe; it originated in Chicago. That is just as true as men tell the truth under oath, as these men have, and there was plenty of evidence in Chicago before Mr. Hoover left, that this was to be the program; yet, sir, you will take it from the people in this country who have reached the limit of their endurance.

I am perfectly willing, Mr. President, for the United States to bend a little further, to take on a little more of a burden, and to assume some further responsibility in order to do justice to those people who have felt the oppression of bureaucracy and kingship for three centuries. I have no sympathy in my heart for any of that remnant of kings and bureaucrats who are fast passing into oblivion and into other places, but I want the people or the taxpayers of the United States to be protected when we take this proposed action. I want men to administer this fund who have a due regard for the people of this country. My desire is to have it administered in such a way that it will serve both those who are to be fed and those who must pay for the feeding.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I was amazed to read in the Washington Post of this morning that we are about to furnish a large quantity of food to Germany and to receive in exchange therefor a certain quantity of Germany's shipping. I read from the article, which attracted my attention this morning and caused my amazement, as follows:

The armistice conference at Treves between the German and allied shipping and food commissions, which include Sir John Beale Anderson and John A. Salter for Great Britain, and Edward N. Hurley, Lewis H. Sheldon, and Howard Heinz for the United States arranged for the delivery to the starving people of Germany from America 70,000 tons of pork and 200,000 tons of cereals. The Germans can negotiate for transformation of a portion of cereal ration into condensed milk for children. We get about 350,000 tons of shipping, half of the available German passenger ships, with capacity for 70,000 home-bound soldiers.

The British get the other half of the passenger tonnage, smaller passenger ships, needed to move the Australians through the Suez Canal, which the *Bismarck* and *Imperator* could not pass. The remuneration to Germany at the current market rate for the used passenger ships will be its credit against the food they get from us. Two million tons of German cargo ships to be used for food shipments will be divided among the allies. All enemy ships are taken "without prejudice as to their final disposition," in which diplomatic phrase the German's find small comfort.

The German ships are to be delivered at designated ports of Great Britain and France. The German sailors who bring them are to be sent back home at the allies' expense. German entreaties for further use of their sailors were denied by our negotiators, among other reasons being that we are not willing to take the risk of sending German-manned boats into American ports.

This is most astounding to me. I am emphatically opposed to such an arrangement. It does not have my approval. I do not believe there is any starvation in Germany. I believe the people of Germany are far better off than are the people of France and of Belgium. They have not felt the war nearly so much or so cruelly as have the people of France or of Belgium. Im-

mediately after the conclusion of the armistice a great cry and clamor went up from Germany to have foodstuffs sent to her alleged starving people. Immediately that the armistice agreement was completed the first thing which we heard was a great cry and clamor from Germany for us to feed the alleged starving people of Germany. They even had the German women undertaking to get into communication with the women of this country in order that the German cry for food might be heard and heeded here. The matter was investigated by careful investigators, and it was found that there was no starvation in Germany; that starvation was not imminent nor was it threatening. It was found that the German people were not in need of food; that they had just harvested their 1918 crop, and had that crop in their cellars and storehouses. It was ascertained that they had sufficient food to carry them through the winter, at least; that there was no suffering because of lack of food. The false cry being exposed, for the time being the clamor of Germany for food quieted, but now it is renewed.

I do not doubt that every man, woman, and child in Germany would go to work and fill their cellars, storehouses, and bins with food, would store away enough food to last a year, and then would make affidavits that they had no food, that they were starving, if they thought that by so doing they could get something for nothing from the United States and could thereby starve to death a few more women and children in France and Belgium, where there is real and great suffering for the necessities of life. That is just about how much credence I put in the cry for food from Germany. I believe nothing that comes from Germany. I believe in nothing in Germany.

We should not furnish the Germans with food in return for ships. We should, as a conquering Nation, take those ships from Germany as a conquered nation. The trouble is that Germany does not feel that she is conquered; she does not feel that she is beaten. The people of Germany feel that they have never surrendered; that they are an unconquered, an unbeaten people. That feeling is paramount in their breasts to-day. I think we made a great mistake in not prosecuting the war until there was an unconditional surrender of Germany on German soil, until there was a smashing military victory over the Germans on German soil. Germany should not only have been beaten to the ground but she should have been beaten into the ground. Germany should have been subjected to a devastating invasion of fire and sword and been made to feel some of the terrible suffering she imposed upon innocent people. The guilty people of Germany should have been made to feel some of the hardships that they imposed upon the innocent.

Germany is not entitled to any consideration from us. Germany violated every principle of international law, of civilized warfare, of humanity and decency, and put herself beyond the pale of consideration. Not only were the German war dogs guilty of such conduct, but the people of Germany backed it up with their hearts, their pocketbooks, and their efforts. I believe that every time a woman or young girl was ravished by a brute of a German soldier in France or Belgium it caused a thrill of joy in the heart of every person in Germany to whom it became known. I believe that every time a little boy had his hands cut off at the wrists, every time a baby was impaled on a bayonet, every time a baby was grabbed out of its mother's arms and had its brains dashed out on the floor by a brutal German soldier, it caused a thrill of joy in the heart of every person in Germany who heard about it. If 1,000,000 German people heard about it, I believe there were 1,000,000 thrills of joy over it; if 10,000,000 people heard about it, I believe there were 10,000,000 thrills of joy over it; if 70,000,000 people—the population of Germany, I believe—had heard about it, I believe it would have caused 70,000,000 thrills of joy in German hearts.

I believe we are starting out to be entirely too soft in our treatment of the people who plunged this world into the most horrible war and devastating outrage upon humanity that has ever been known. The people who waged a wicked, infamous, criminal, and fiendish warfare upon the civilization of the world should be punished for it; they should be punished adequately; they should be punished severely. There is merit and justice in adequate and severe punishment under such circumstances. Yet I find from this morning's Washington Post that the people of Germany are renewing their oft-repeated whimpering and whining about the terms that are apparently in store for them. I read that Prince Lichnowsky, former German ambassador to Great Britain, yesterday gave the following statement to the Associated Press:

A peace of right and justice, provided it is not merely to be a phrase behind which a peace of violence conceals itself as a pax Britannica, can only be such a peace as neither enslaves nor mutilates the conquered and which leaves him the possibility of recuperating, of paying his debts, and of entering with complete confidence into the peaceful competition of a society of nations. A league of nations which has its roots only in statutes and is not in the hearts of peoples is worthless.

Further down in his statement he says:

Hence a peace of justice would be only such a one as neither boycotts us nor lays upon us intolerable financial burdens which would make us dependents for all time, nor one which creates untenable borders and robs us of lands which we require geographically and economically.

It is the constant cry and refrain of the Germans that we must not be hard on Germany; that our terms to Germany should not be severe; that we must not humiliate Germany; that we should permit Germany quickly to recuperate her power and resuscitate her resources and take her place among the nations of the earth. That is the talk of a nation that assumes to speak to the other nations of the earth as an equal, on an equal footing, and not as a conquered nation, beneath the notice and almost beneath the contempt of the decent peoples of the world; not as a nation that has violated every precept of humanity and decency and which is entitled to no consideration except such as its conquerors see fit to give to it. I believe that cry will be kept up time after time, in season and out of season, until Germany will manage to obtain terms which she does not deserve and should not receive. That is evidently now the game of Germany. It is her deliberate plan, by trickery, deception, falsehood, appeals to pity, to obtain that which she could not win by war. I fear she may partially succeed.

If we vote the \$100,000,000 proposed to be appropriated in the bill now before this body for consideration, I believe it will only be a short time until we will be called upon to vote \$100,000,000, or more than that, to the alleged starving people of Germany, when there will be no necessity for it, when there will be no starvation in Germany, and when her alleged starvation will be merely a sham and pretense, a wicked deceit and falsehood, mere camouflage.

I am opposed to anything which approaches it or may lead to it. I believe that the people of Germany and the people who helped her to perpetrate a monstrous outrage on the world should be made to feel the hard heel of justice, and justice of the right kind. I am opposed to taking any step which may lead up to dealing softly or in an unjust manner with Germany. I say "unjust," because if she is given easy terms it will be unjust to all the rest of the world, at least to all countries and peoples not in league with her deviltry.

It seems to me that the United States is about to assume the rôle of being the big rich uncle to all the remainder of the world; that we are going to be a big rich uncle to all of Europe, friend and foe alike; and that if anybody needs help over there or gets into trouble, they will turn to Uncle Sam, their big rich uncle, for assistance. If we make the proposed appropriation which is before us for consideration, I believe it will encourage the unstable, restless, dissatisfied peoples of the remainder of the world to engage in revolution, in uprisings, in civil strife, in internecine warfare; to burn and destroy; to leave their vocations and destroy each other's crops and products; to neglect the cultivation of the soil; and to spend their time in Bolshevism and revolution and contentions among one another. Then, when they run out of food, I fear they will say, "Oh, we do not need to bother about that; Uncle Sam, our big rich uncle, the big rich uncle of all the world, will see that we get food; Uncle Sam will feed us; let Uncle Sam do it."

I am opposed to encouraging any such feeling or setting any such example or creating any such precedent. I am opposed to doing anything or taking any step that will be likely to create any such sentiment or hope in the hearts of the other peoples of the world. If we are going to feed the people of Europe this year, to keep them from becoming Bolsheviks, we will have to do it next year; for just so long as you let people know that you will feed them in order to make them abstain from assaults upon the civilization of the world, they will take you at your word and make you feed them. If we embark upon this policy, I think it will be only a few weeks until we will have to repeat it; and, if we continue it through this year, we will have to repeat it next year and the year after; and just so long as we are willing to feed people, to keep them in idleness, to keep them from becoming anarchists and making assaults upon the civilization of the world, we will have to keep it up; there will be no end to it. This will be merely the beginning and a very bad beginning, in my opinion. I believe the principle is wrong; I believe the policy is dangerous. I think it mistaken generosity. It may do credit to the heart, but I think it fraught with danger. In my opinion it is more good hearted than sound, safe, or just.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Martin, Ky.	Sherman
Borah	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smoot
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Thomas
Fletcher	Kenyon	Page	Trammell
France	Kirby	Pittman	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Poinexter	Wadsworth
Gay	La Follette	Pollock	Warren
Gerry	Lenroot	Pomerene	Weeks
Hale	Lewis	Saulsbury	Williams
Harding	McKellar	Shafroth	
Henderson	McNary	Sheppard	

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT], the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] are detained on official business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Arizona has asked for the yeas and nays on his amendment. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ASHURST. Then, of course, Mr. President, if the Senate refuses me the yeas and nays I shall be obliged to consume considerable time in order to convince the Senate that it ought to grant the yeas and nays, because of course the bill is not going to pass until the yeas and nays are called on this amendment.

Senators have been very industrious—

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator announces that he will annoy the Senate into doing what he wants?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir; I want the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I raise the point of order that the Senator has spoken twice on this matter, and it is not now in order for him to address the Senate again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator spoken twice to-day?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And twice on the amendment?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir; I have.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then that seems to be the end of the Senator's rights under the rule.

Mr. ASHURST. Well, I will, of course, submit. I am overpowered. My very learned and beloved friend, the chairman of the committee, has been industriously going about and urging Senators not to grant the yeas and nays.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I should not have made the point of order except that the Senator boldly declared that his purpose was to torture the Senate into doing what he wanted it to do.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am defeated, and I yield as gracefully as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. ASHURST. I call for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is called for. All in favor of the amendment will rise. [A pause.] Those opposed will rise. [A pause.] The amendment is lost.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have already been refused.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I reserve the right to offer the amendment in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to do that. The bill is still open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether he expects to get a vote on the bill to-night? I have it in mind to submit certain observations, but I do not want to do so to-night, and I will not do so at great length at any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I have been anxious every day for several days to get a vote, and I confidently expected a vote to-day; but the Senate, in the exercise of its privilege, has debated the matter longer than I expected, as Senators had a right to do. At this late hour I would not be willing to pursue a course that would compel the Senator from Iowa to address the Senate when he would prefer to put it off until to-morrow.

AMENDMENT TO INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota to pay the expenses of the general council of that tribe to be held at Ball Club, Minn., July, 1919, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, January 23, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 22, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Conden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We lift up our hearts in gratitude to Thee, our God and our Father, for the endowments of mind and soul with which Thou hast blessed us; for the knowledge which by experience and research we have accumulated; and we pray for wisdom, that we may use the endowments and our knowledge for the uplift of humanity, that Thy kingdom may be advanced upon the earth. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has certificates from authorities of certain States that the prohibition amendment has been ratified, from the States of Colorado, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Florida, Indiana, Washington, Oregon, Nebraska, and North Dakota, and they will be filed in the archives of the House.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14516, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14516, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, with Mr. FERRIS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 14516, the Diplomatic and Consular appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia, \$2,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph. The committee throughout this title, I notice, have increased the salaries of interpreters and student interpreters herein from \$500 to \$1,000, in a few instances, possibly not aggregating as much as that. I would like to inquire the reason for the committee's action in making this decided increase in these interpreters and student interpreters?

Mr. FLOOD. The reason which actuated the committee was the statement of the officials of the State Department made to the committee that it was impossible to get the proper kind of men to accept those positions now at the present salaries. They are not able to live on the salaries, and they could not get Americans to take up these difficult languages and learn them so as to be efficient interpreters, and if they could not the result would be we would be dependent upon non-Americans to render this necessary and valuable service to our representatives abroad, and that would be the case at times when it was essential to have Americans in all of our diplomatic and consular service. The interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia is getting \$1,000 a year. They just could not expect a man of sufficient intelligence, an American citizen, to stay there for that salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman inform the committee whether this position has been heretofore filled by an American

citizen or whether the position was not accorded to some native who was acquainted with the English language and the native language?

Mr. FLOOD. The attempt has been to fill it with Americans, but they have sometimes been unable to do that on account of the salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would question whether it was ever intended to fill the position of interpreter and keep him continuously employed on that work at a salary of \$1,000 in Persia.

Mr. FLOOD. The effort has been made to get American citizens in the student interpreter corps. American citizens go in the student corps and study these languages and then they are promoted into interpreters, and the effort has been and desire is to have all Americans. They have been unable sometimes to get Americans for the reason of the inadequacy of the salary and the argument appealed to the committee, and we made an increase for that reason, because we want to Americanize the entire Consular and Diplomatic Service, and I will say to the gentleman most of the increases in this bill are directed to that purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. What are these student interpreters provided in the second paragraph following doing during their matriculation?

Mr. FLOOD. During the course of study they render some service to the legations as clerks, but not a great deal, because their time is practically taken up in study. We provide a teacher for each student interpreter, and their time is principally taken up in the study of these languages, but such time as they can spare they render services in the way of interpreting and other things at the consulates or legations or the embassies to which they may be nearest.

Mr. STAFFORD. What salary do they receive after they complete the course of study?

Mr. FLOOD. They are promoted from students to interpreters, and they have been receiving a salary of \$1,000 to \$1,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the provision in the bill that they have been receiving that salary upon their graduation?

Mr. FLOOD. When they finish their course of study, when they acquire sufficient knowledge of these languages to become interpreters, they are made interpreters, and as interpreters have been getting from \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the item in the bill providing for their payment after they graduate as full interpreters?

Mr. FLOOD. The item the gentleman read, interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is the only provision in this bill for the employment of two interpreters?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. One as the interpreter to legation and consulate general to Persia and the other as the interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam?

Mr. FLOOD. No; there are some more.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will be glad to have the gentleman point out any provision for the employment of full interpreters.

Mr. FLOOD. The Consular Service has a number of interpreters.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly point out the item in the bill which provides for their employment after they graduate from these classes of instruction?

Mr. FLOOD. That is paid out of the fund providing for the salaries of consular offices, out of a lump sum.

We have in the service now quite a number of interpreters.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am more concerned as to salaries they are receiving on their graduation. Certainly, if they receive \$1,500 as students, they would receive more when they qualify to perform the work of the Government as interpreters.

Mr. FLOOD. In some of the consulates they receive \$2,000 a year. There are 16 of them in addition to these to whom the gentleman refers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it not a fact that no interpreter who is paid out of the lump-sum allowance for pay of consulates receives less than \$2,000 a year?

Mr. FLOOD. I think so; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, to the present paragraph I will withdraw the reservation of the point of order. The chairman has made out a meritorious case.

The Clerk read as follows:

Interpreter to legation and consulate general to Bangkok, Siam, \$2,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In the course of the debate yesterday afternoon I referred to an item on page 2 of the bill, line 10, being an appropriation for the salary of our minister to Costa Rica. Our minister to Costa Rica is Mr. Edward J. Hale, of North Carolina. I stated

at that time that it was my information that Mr. Hale had returned from Costa Rica two years ago or thereabouts to his home in North Carolina and had enjoyed life in North Carolina ever since. That statement, I understand, was not disputed, but my further statement, that during that entire two years he had been also enjoying the payment of the full salary of \$10,000 a year for doing nothing, was disputed by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood]. I called this morning at the State Department to get the information about the case, because I had no desire to mislead the House even innocently.

I am informed that the facts are these: That Mr. Hale came back from Costa Rica in April, 1917; that he went to his home in North Carolina and has never been back to Costa Rica during the almost two years which have since intervened; that he has done no Government work; that he has performed no diplomatic functions of any kind during that period; but that he has been regularly in receipt of the full salary of \$10,000 a year during the entire time.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Is there not any process by which you can stop such stealing as that from the Treasury?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. What is it?

Mr. FLOOD. The process, if the gentleman is correct, and if the State Department officials correctly stated it to him, is that the official who is responsible for it should be impeached, because it is a clear violation of the law. Section 1742 provides that they shall not receive salary for the time during which they may be absent, by leave or otherwise, for a period exceeding 60 days in any one year. If anyone in the State Department has allowed Mr. Hale to stay away from his post of duty for two years without doing any Government work or rendering any service to the Government and draw his salary that official has violated the statute law of this country. Will the gentleman name the man who is responsible for it?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know who is responsible for it. It is the gentleman's administration.

Mr. FLOOD. Who at the State Department gave the gentleman this information?

Mr. ROGERS. The information is a fact. I do not see why I should bring in the individual's name.

Mr. FLOOD. I called up the State Department this morning and was told that it could not be a fact, owing to the law I have referred to.

Mr. ROGERS. There seems to be a pretty square conflict of authority there.

Mr. GARNER. Somebody has got to come across with the authority.

Mr. FLOOD. We would like to know the gentleman who is responsible for this.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not know, and I do not think my informant is responsible for the situation.

Mr. FLOOD. I called up Mr. Wilbur J. Carr, the director of the Consular Service, on the telephone and told him of the statement the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers] made yesterday, and he said there must be some mistake—that payment of salaries under the circumstances stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts was prohibited by law.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. GARD. After the gentleman has made his frank statement does he not think that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers] ought to tell us his informant?

Mr. ROGERS. I have no great objection to telling the name of my informant. But what has that to do with it? He is not responsible for the condition there. This is a question of fact.

Mr. GARNER. It is a question of fact, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood] says that Mr. Carr, a responsible man in the State Department, says this is not a fact. Now, you assert, as a Member of this House, that you have sufficient information so that you can assert it yourself as a fact.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not assert it as a fact. I say I went to the State Department and consulted the man best qualified to give the information. I simply transmitted to the House that information. If the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], the chairman of the committee, will call up the Acting Secretary of State or the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Phillips, he can get the information for the House within five minutes. Mr. Carr is a most admirable gentleman, but he is connected with the Consular Service and not primarily with the Diplomatic Service. If I am mistaken, I will apologize to the State Department. I went this morning to the man whom I believed best fitted to

advise me and obtained the information from him. Why should I get him in trouble by giving his name?

Mr. GARNER. I agree with the gentleman as to that.

Mr. ROGERS. Why should I get that man in trouble?

Mr. GARNER. I think it is the duty of some one to get the facts concerning this matter from the highest authority, probably the Acting Secretary of State, and ascertain the facts in the matter. If these facts are true, as stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, some one is violating the law. It may be the Auditor for the State Department or some one else whose duty it is to certify that this minister has been absent from his post for more than 60 days. But it is the duty of some one there to certify as to that fact.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. How long will it take the chairman of the committee to get before him the proper officers who have this information and place this information before the House officially.

Mr. FLOOD. As I stated, I called up Mr. Carr.

Mr. DOWELL. But that is not the proper way to get at the facts.

Mr. FLOOD. That is the only way we can get information of this kind quickly; that is, by getting it from some official of the State Department.

Mr. DOWELL. Can not the gentleman call these men before the committee and swear them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I called up Mr. Carr, as I said, and told him of the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Rogers], and called his attention to his statement and to my statement in reply. He said I was certainly correct as to the law, but that he would have the facts in the Hale case looked up and would send me a statement this afternoon.

Mr. DOWELL. It occurs to me that this is a question of fact that the committee should lay before the House officially and correctly.

Mr. FLOOD. I have made the statement repeatedly as to what the law requires, but the gentleman from Massachusetts did not raise this matter before the committee. The committee were taken entirely by surprise by the gentleman's statement. We heard no suggestion of the matter from him in committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Suppose the gentleman did not possess the information at the time he was in attendance in committee. Has he not the right to expose it in the House? The gentleman from Virginia has called up a gentleman who is not thoroughly versed in the matter, although a very estimable man, but he is not charged with the responsibility for this service.

Mr. FLOOD. I called up a man who is very well versed in these matters.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman from Massachusetts said he got it from a man who is not responsible.

Mr. ROGERS. I did not say that. I said I could not divulge his name and thus possibly get him into serious trouble. If the gentleman will permit, I said I did not know whether my informant was officially required to pass upon the question of salary or not. He is entirely responsible.

The gentleman from Virginia says I "sprang" this matter upon the committee yesterday.

Mr. FLOOD. I did not use that word.

Mr. ROGERS. That was the fair inference to be derived from what the gentleman said. The fact is I had no information on this matter until about a week after the hearings on the measure were completed. If I had had the information at the time the hearings were held I would have raised the question in committee. I had certainly supposed it was perfectly ethical for me to ask the question of the gentleman from Virginia yesterday afternoon in the course of the debate.

Now, one other word. I do not know this Mr. Hale, of North Carolina, but I do know that he is in his eightieth year. He was born in 1839, and, so far as I am informed, he is perfectly well satisfied to stay on indefinitely in North Carolina. He finds the climate of North Carolina much more salubrious than that of San Jose, Costa Rica. I do not want you to think that it is necessary for his protection or pleasure that this House should take action that would send him back to Costa Rica. Mr. Hale was one of the horde of gentlemen whom Mr. Bryan selected as ministers in 1913 and inflicted upon the Latin American Re-

publics. So far as I know, he is a thoroughly estimable gentleman. But he is not a diplomat and never was a diplomat. I question whether he was ever capable of handling adequately the affairs of state in an exceedingly difficult post such as that of Costa Rica.

Mr. POUL. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is not the first time that Mr. Hale has been in the foreign service of the Government, if I am not mistaken. I will not say that I am entirely correct, but I think he was consul to Manchester at one time.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand he was consul at Manchester from 1885 to 1889. He was also—

Mr. POUL. I do not say that gives him any peculiar equipment, but—

Mr. ROGERS. He was also, I may say, a Confederate veteran of the Civil War, and I think by trade he is a newspaper man.

Mr. POUL. And one of the most estimable men in our State.

Mr. ROGERS. I have absolutely no reflection to make upon his character, but I understand there may be some question as to his diplomatic ability.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman is better versed in these matters than I am, but is there any authority whereby payments of money made under these circumstances may be returned to the Treasury?

Mr. ROGERS. I would rather have the gentleman's judgment, as an eminent lawyer, than mine.

Mr. GARD. I thought perhaps the gentleman would know of it.

Mr. ROGERS. No. I have not looked into that phase of the case.

Mr. STEDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I came in late and have heard some of the remarks just made, but not all of them, concerning Mr. Hale. I deem it my duty to say what I know of Mr. Hale. I have known him all my life, ever since I was a boy. He is one of the most accomplished scholars and ablest men in our State, and has been so regarded always. He was consul to Manchester, England, and won the great approbation of the people of Manchester during Mr. Cleveland's first administration. I think he has never yet held a place of any kind that he has not filled with credit to this country.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman think his appointment was an infliction on the people of Latin America?

Mr. STEDMAN. No. He is a man of extraordinary ability and estimable character, and is so recognized by everyone who knows him.

Mr. DOWELL. But the question is whether he is in the service or not.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEDMAN. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can the gentleman from North Carolina enlighten us about his age? How old is he?

Mr. STEDMAN. He is about 78. He is one year older than I.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That is rather late to start in a diplomatic career, is it not? He is rather old to start in the Diplomatic Service, is he not?

Mr. STEDMAN. He is as well able to perform his duty as my friend is able to perform his duty here, and he has filled with honor every position which he has ever filled.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. STEDMAN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman give the reason why Prof. Hale has not been performing his duties at his assigned post?

Mr. STEDMAN. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. STAFFORD. The question at issue here is why he is receiving the salary as minister to Costa Rica when he has been absent from his post for a year or more, and yet the statute directs that no salary shall be paid to a diplomatic representative when he is absent for more than 60 days.

Mr. STEDMAN. I do not know anything about the facts.

Mr. STAFFORD. No one is questioning the estimable character of the gentleman's constituent. The question at issue is what I have stated.

Mr. STEDMAN. Without knowing anything about the facts, I know that Mr. Hale would not be at home without the consent and approbation of the State Department. He is a man of the highest sense of duty. I do not know anything about the facts of this particular case, but I know the man. I know he

is a man of marked ability and of the highest character. I do not know why he is at home. Probably the gentleman can find out from the State Department without any trouble; but I know he is there for some good reason, because I know the man.

Mr. STAFFORD. What the membership would like to know is why he is at home.

Mr. STEDMAN. The gentleman should go to the State Department to find that out.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I intended to bring this matter up again this afternoon when I get the facts fully from the State Department. The gentleman in the State Department with whom I talked had to go to the Senate to appear before the Appropriations Committee there in reference to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill. What he told me was that Mr. Hale had not been drawing his salary. I will get the full facts this afternoon, and I would like the gentleman from Massachusetts then to give us the name of his informant in the State Department, if his information is in conflict with that which we will get from Mr. Carr, who is going to make a thorough investigation of it. We will find out why Mr. Hale is at home.

The attitude of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] toward the appointees of the Democratic administration in the diplomatic service is perfectly well known to this House. I have never heard him commend any of them except one, and he is dead. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. That is a very consistent position for the gentleman to take.

Mr. FLOOD. They have rendered as splendid service as any diplomatic corps ever did. The gentleman is a believer in the idea that all of our diplomats, our ministers, and our ambassadors should be appointed from the list of rich secretaries, whom the Republican Party during the administrations of Presidents Roosevelt and Taft were appointed secretaries. We have classified them, but nine-tenths of them have always been Republicans. They were put in there by Republican administrations. They are in there now, and, of course, they are howling to be promoted to positions that half or three-fourths of them are not qualified to fill. I know we have some secretaries in our Diplomatic Service who are worthy to represent this country in the highest diplomatic positions, but there are dozens of them who are unfit ever to represent this country in these important diplomatic positions, and they are the very ones who are constantly trying to have themselves promoted from secretaries to ministers and thence on up to ambassadors. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is one of their most ardent advocates and has been for years; but because he wants to promote his Republican friends I do not see why he should make this ungenerous attack—to say the least of it—upon Maj. Hale, of North Carolina. There are no doubt good reasons why he remained in this country, and I will supply those reasons when I get them from the State Department.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I move to strike out the last two words. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Did we not appropriate the money for some proceedings in Costa Rica two years ago?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did we not make an appropriation for the legation at Costa Rica?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Has there been anyone there to look after our affairs?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, we have an acting chargé there.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is the gentleman sure of that?

Mr. FLOOD. I am not sure of it, but I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like to make this further inquiry: Have we officially recognized the present existing government of Costa Rica?

Mr. FLOOD. We have not.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That was my understanding.

Mr. ROGERS. The fact is that we have no diplomatic representation of any kind in Costa Rica, and Costa Rica has no diplomatic representation of any kind in the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. I may be mistaken, but I supposed the secretary would remain there as chargé d'affaires.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If it is a fact that we have no diplomatic representation there, should not Minister Hale have resigned his position long ago? There is really no office for him to fill.

Mr. FLOOD. As I stated yesterday, I have not undertaken to speak with knowledge as to the reasons why Mr. Hale was not in Costa Rica, but my understanding is that it was because our Government had not recognized the existing Government of Costa Rica.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. How could a man continue to act as minister to a country when we do not recognize any government in that country?

Mr. FLOOD. We do not recognize the existing Russian Government, and yet the Russians have an ambassador here.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am glad to know that, for there is no more splendid man to represent them, but I think the gentleman will find that the existing Russian Government does not recognize him nor does it do any business through him.

Mr. FLOOD. The Russian Government does not recognize him but our Government does.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is entirely different. We unquestionably find him an individual that we can do business with bearing on the Russian situation and the Russian people, but he in no sense assumes to represent the existing Government of Russia.

Mr. FLOOD. He does not represent the existing Government of Russia, but he represents Russia here and we recognize him.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I question his representing Russia here, but he is one of the most splendid representatives that they could have.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield for me to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. If, as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota, there is no government in Costa Rica that we recognize, certainly it would not be necessary to appoint and continue to pay a minister down there supposed to represent our Government.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know the facts in the case. When I get them I will give them to the gentleman, and I am satisfied they will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. GARNER. Of course, if we are so situated in this country that we can not find in the country but one man fit to serve as a minister to Costa Rica, and we must pay him \$10,000 a year indefinitely for a term of years to hold a particular place, I agree with the gentleman. But when we do not recognize that country I do not think that it is necessary that he should draw the salary and that we should continue to keep him in cold storage for the purpose of sending him there when we do recognize the government.

Mr. STEDMAN. If the gentleman will yield, we are all talking without knowing the facts. I think if you telephone to Mr. Tumulty he will give you the facts about this Costa Rica business.

Mr. FLOOD. We will undoubtedly find out during the day from the State Department.

Mr. GARNER. We are trying to ascertain the facts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion, whatever it was. I want to get at this matter, because we are becoming crazy in this country in spending money, and we ought not to be dishing it out at \$10,000 a year for some one that is not doing any service. The statement was made on the floor that Mr. Hale, from North Carolina, has been appointed minister to Costa Rica; that he has not been there for two years; that he has been continually drawing a salary although he does no work. Mr. Flood read from the statutes where it is positively against the law to pay him a salary if he was 60 days away from his post for any purpose. The statute says "for any purpose." Now, how that can be done I can not understand. Of course Mr. Tumulty, or somebody else, may be able to explain it, but to the ordinary citizen like myself I can not understand why it is necessary to pay a man \$10,000 a year to do absolutely nothing in face of the statute which says he can not draw the salary.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it not true in this instance that there is no position to occupy?

Mr. FLOOD. There is a position to occupy.

Mr. DOWELL. We do not recognize the Government of Costa Rica, therefore there is no position as minister there.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say that as quick as I heard this I went in and tried to get the highest official in the State Department. I got hold of Mr. Phillips. He said he did not know, but he would look the matter up and advise me at the earliest moment, and hoped that he could advise me within 10 minutes. This may be one of other cases that exist of that kind; and if it is, the quicker the House finds it out and the country knows it, the better.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARNER. Certainly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. As to the question of fact whether Mr. Hale has been drawing a salary or not, I called up the State Department and heard from Mr. Phillips, who has made an investigation since talking with the gentleman from Texas. He

says that Mr. Hale has in fact been drawing his salary up to the 30th of last December, and hence it is presumable that the salary is now going on. Mr. Phillips did not know exactly how long Mr. Hale had been away from his post, but certainly he has been away for more than a year, and during that time he has been drawing the salary in full up to the 1st of the month. That disposes of the question of fact, and if the law is as stated by the gentleman from Virginia, that the salary could not continue for more than 60 days after the minister or diplomatic officer absents himself from the position, then it is a clear violation of the law.

Mr. FLOOD. Absolutely; and the gentlemen who are responsible for it should be exposed and proceeded against.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take more than five minutes of the time devoted to the consideration of this bill, but I have here an official memorandum from the headquarters of the Four hundred and seventy-second Engineers in regard to the discharge of soldiers which, I think, should be called to the attention of Congress. Many Members, I know, have had letters written to them since the armistice by privates, who have told of the threats that were made that they would be considered lacking in duty toward the country in trying to get out of the Army, but it remains for me to receive a statement to that effect in writing and with it a threat that if these men do not continue to perform duties here they will be sent to a less desirable place and further delayed in getting out of the Army.

The privates to whom I refer were engaged in making maps here in the city of Washington in the Coast and Geodetic Survey and were especially engaged of late in the making of a great military map of the United States, which might take years to complete. They undertook to secure their discharges to get back to their jobs, and they furnished affidavits that the jobs were waiting for them, but they are met with a letter such as the one I shall read, and I ask the Members of the House to remember as they hear that letter read that the men were induced to enter the service—the Four hundred and seventy-second Engineers—in response to such alluring posters as that which I hold up, calling for enlistment of surveyors, map men, to reproduce military and aeroplane maps, the presumption being that the work would be done abroad.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Do not fail to call attention to the fact that in the picture the dugouts were adjacent, which shows that they were almost in the presence of the enemy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is the poster, showing a soldier out mapping the war country, as we know had to be done in the war zone.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It was in fact done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There were engineers there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The fact that these particular gentlemen to whom my colleague is about to refer did not get there does not differentiate them from thousands and millions of others in the different branches of the service who did not get there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No, sir; of course, not.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Then, why does the gentleman proceed to bring that poster here?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me read the letter, and I know that no Member on either side of the House will do other than join in a demand for an inquiry and possibly a court-martial of the men who authorized and put out this circular letter, which I now read:

HEADQUARTERS FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND ENGINEERS,
Washington, January 7, 1919.

Memorandum 1.

It has come to the attention of the commanding officer that men of this regiment on various details in Washington, especially those who have requested discharge, are laying down on their work and not "playing the game."

The attention of such men is called to the fact that they have been enlisted in a service which did not require their encountering the dangers and disagreeable features of overseas duty and which practically insured their returning safe and sound to their friends and relatives. Furthermore, details on duty in Washington, D. C., have been receiving commutation of quarters and rations, which has materially augmented their pay. Except for a short period, they have had very little drill, guard duty, and no kitchen police and other disagreeable duties of camp life. Under these circumstances the commanding officer considers that any man who lays down on the job or fails to "play the game" is a mighty poor specimen of a man, and such men are apt to find themselves still in the service but in some much less agreeable location.

This does not mean that applications for discharge will be ignored, but such applications will be thoroughly investigated, and where the cases warrant, discharges will be made. In any event, discharges are being made as rapidly as the completion of the various projects will warrant.

The commanding officer sincerely hopes that the Four hundred and seventy-second Engineers may come to the end of their demobilization with as clean and as brilliant a record as they have carried heretofore.

GUY V. SWEET,
Captain of Engineers.

Now, the charge is this, that these particular men, quite a number of them, were brought from Florida and set to making a military or defense map of the United States, the making of which would take a long period of time; that they presented proper applications for discharge with proper affidavits; that the discharges were denied and were not recommended on the ground that the work had to be done and was important; and that common comment around the office was that certain officers wanted to hold on to their jobs, and therefore held to the necessity of this grand United States defense map making; and the further charge that they got out that circular, which was offensive, and is, in my opinion, an insult to every man who put on the uniform of the United States and did not get overseas, to every man who was kept here in Army work, whether he was a medical officer, a quartermaster's clerk, a potato peeler, or what not. All were working, and working willingly, at whatever task assigned.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But when they did apply they knew they were going to make maps?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That part of the first paragraph is only a statement of facts, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They presumed, and I think most of the men who went into the Army did, that they would be given service overseas, but when they were not given that service they made no complaint but proceeded to do their duty as part of the Four hundred and seventy-second Engineers; but when on the 9th of January of this year, while they were undertaking honestly and rightly to secure discharges from the Army, they were then told that they were lying down on the job and they are threatened, if they do not go on with the map making, they will be sent to a less desirable place, and some of them were actually ordered sent to some place in Florida. I believe that under congressional pressure all have now been discharged; but that circular letter No. 1, by order of the commanding officer, remains, and I think that the commanding officer and others of his kind had better be discharged, and quickly, at that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

For 10 student interpreters in China, who shall be citizens of the United States, and whose duty it shall be to study the Chinese language with a view to supplying interpreters to the legation and consulates in China, at \$1,500 each, \$15,000: *Provided*, That the method of selecting said student interpreters shall be nonpartisan: *And provided further*, That upon receiving such appointment each student interpreter shall sign an agreement to continue in the service as interpreter to the legation and consulates in China so long as his services may be required within a period of five years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, under that reservation I desire to ask the gentleman from Virginia a question in reference to the policy of the State Department in issuing passports. How long is the war restriction to continue in reference to the issuance of passports?

Mr. FLOOD. I can not answer that question. I believe it will continue as long as the department thinks there is necessity for it here or our friendly Governments request it.

Mr. GARNER. As to what the department is thinking while the head of it is over in Europe I am not prepared to say, but it looks to me whether they are thinking or not they are not functioning. If the gentleman will permit me, I desire to refer particularly to the question of issuing passports on the Mexican border, about which I do know something. I do not see anything on the face of the earth which requires the people on the border to send up a dollar to Washington to get a passport to go over 50 miles to some ranch and come back the next day. That has never been done heretofore except in war times. Then it was to prevent the sending of spies into Mexico and getting information. Everything was done to keep them out. But this war is over, and so far as we know there is no reason why everybody in this country could not go to Mexico if they want to go, and I do not see the necessity of continuing this restriction of passports as it is now continued along the Mexican border. I had the pleasure a day or two ago of calling the attention of the Bureau of Passports to it, and it suggested that I write the Secretary. I thought I would ask the

gentleman so the RECORD would show, at least, some one was observing the fact that we still desire to do business with Mexico; they are watching the border and continuing unnecessary restrictions.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is directing his inquiry to the situation in Mexico.

Mr. GARNER. Particularly with Mexico, not throughout the country, because I know nothing about that more than any other Member of Congress; but I do know something about things down there, because I get from 10 to 25 letters and telegrams a day to hurry along passports, and I find there has got to be a statement made and it has to be transmitted to the Bureau of Passports and back to the Mexican division, and then I do not know where else, before they can begin to issue a passport.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with the gentleman, so far as the Mexican situation is concerned, that the time has come to change the policy with reference to passports.

Mr. GARNER. That is all I want to get out of the gentleman, and I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the point of order to get more detailed information as to why the department has difficulty in obtaining applicants to fill the positions of these student interpreters and also to ascertain in reference to support of student interpreters in China and Japan.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman asked if it was difficult to get them. That is the information the committee had.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, when the war was on the young men who were likely to be qualified and desirous of filling these positions went into the war. There was a shortage of labor in clerical positions and in all positions, and I am not surprised that college men have not lately been seeking these positions. If that is the only reason for increasing the salary from \$1,000 to \$1,500 I think it is something ephemeral.

Mr. FLOOD. It is one reason, you know. The gentleman means the difficulty in getting them at this particular time? It is always difficult to get them at \$1,000 salary. It was difficult in the past, and it is more difficult now, and it will be in the future.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the testimony which shows it has been difficult before the war to get these men into the Government service on being paid \$1,000 and their expenses paid? What has been received in allowances in addition to the salary of \$1,000?

Mr. FLOOD. They received \$1,000 and \$125 allowed for a teacher for them, which we propose to raise to \$150, because it is very difficult to get the tuition for \$125 now. Then, there is some allowance for quarters.

Mr. STAFFORD. What do these students have in all? Is this clear salary, and is expense of maintenance and support borne by the Government in these foreign ports?

Mr. FLOOD. We give them enough to support them over there in the Government service, and they get a salary and allowance, and we pay the teachers. Now, Mr. Carr gave a good deal of information on this subject, and he said, on page 77 of the hearings:

Mr. CARR. These positions are now filled; that is, most of them are filled. But the difficulty is we are not getting the type of men we need. We need as high a type of men as we can get in those places, young men from college, and men who, with study, in two or three or four years can develop sufficiently to go out as first-class vice consuls, and a little later take charge of consulates. The kind of men we have been getting in the last three or four years has not been up to the standard or up to the requirements.

The CHAIRMAN. You take them as students?

Mr. CARR. We take them as students and keep them at the legation for two years until they pass an examination in the language, and then send them out to the consulates.

The CHAIRMAN. Then they become interpreters?

Mr. CARR. Then they become interpreters.

The CHAIRMAN. Then they are promoted to vice consuls?

Mr. CARR. Then they are promoted to vice consuls, and ultimately to consuls.

That was the general statement made time and again before the committee, namely, that it is very difficult to get educated young Americans to go there and study these languages at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is false economy to place too low a salary for applicants for the Government service if it will keep out a higher grade of men who will ultimately be of more value to the Government service. I was of the impression that young men upon graduation from college would be willing to take up this work at a compensation of \$1,000 a year.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think it is the desire to have any boys take it up unless they expect to make this a life work; that is, to become interpreters and vice consuls, and then consuls and consuls general.

Mr. STAFFORD. Believing the Government should seek the very best of our college men, and that perhaps \$1,000 is not sufficient entrance salary, I am inclined to withdraw my reservation of the point of order, but if the gentleman has something more to support that position I would be glad to have him give it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. Here is something more that was said on the subject:

These men of ours have an opportunity for promotion to a reasonable compensation. For instance, we have in China to-day men who have graduated from the student corps, a number of men who are consuls and consuls general, the highest one at the present time being the present consul general at Tientsin, a post which pays \$5,500 a year. We have another one at Canton, receiving a salary of \$4,500, and others at different places. At Tsingtau we have a man receiving about \$4,000, and at Vladivostok one getting \$4,000, and at Dairen one receiving \$4,000, and all of them are men who began as \$1,000 students. Of course, if they were with some commercial company they would probably, in the same length of time, be getting more money. The average offer of the Standard Oil Co. to our men is as a rule from 50 to 100 per cent more than we pay them.

Then I asked him this question:

Yet it is necessary that the corps be maintained?

He replied:

If it is not maintained, then we will have to go back to employing Chinese or Japanese or Armenians, or other natives to do our interpreting, and I do not think it is a safe thing to do. We can not ever expect absolutely to take the place of the native for interpreting work. We can not expect to send men there and have them become so familiar with the language that they will know it as a native knows it and be able to read and write and speak it perfectly. Indeed, such familiarity with the oriental languages is for the most part unnecessary, though desirable. But we must have American officers sufficiently familiar with the language to act as a check upon the local interpreters whom we are bound to employ. There is where the advantage in having these men lies and makes their employment imperative.

Mr. STAFFORD. So I understand, from the reading of the testimony, that this is a school of instruction whereby they qualify not only for interpreters but, which is more important, for the Consular Service in these foreign countries, where it is essential to have a knowledge of the language?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. While I have the floor, and desire to expedite the consideration of the bill, may I inquire what is covered by the provision in lines 4 and 5, where you increase the allowances for payment of the cost of tuition of student interpreters at the rate of \$200 per annum each?

Mr. FLOOD. Each student has to have an instructor, and they have been paying an instructor \$125 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. One hundred and eighty dollars, I believe, in China, \$125 in Japan, and \$125 in Turkey.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. In Japan particularly they find it impossible to get them for that sum, and propose to equalize them all and make them \$200 a year apiece.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then a tutor to each student will receive \$200 a year for the instruction?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order as to the salary increase.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, \$48,200.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Can the gentleman inform me how we can possibly recognize the so-called Russian ambassador, Mr. Bakhmeteff, if he represents a government which does not exist?

Mr. FLOOD. We are doing it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Then you recognize Mr. Bakhmeteff?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; as the Russian ambassador.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would like to ask the gentleman where Mr. Francis is at this time?

Mr. FLOOD. In London, in a hospital.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How long has he been in the hospital?

Mr. FLOOD. For several weeks.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House, and particularly the attention of the gentleman from Virginia and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the conditions in Russia concerning our ambassador there. If there is one man in the United States who does not understand, and never did understand, the Russian conditions, it is Mr. Francis. In the performance of his duties there I consider him absolutely hopelessly incompetent.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. One minute, please. If the chairman of the committee will take the trouble to read the reports of Mr. North Winship, our consul general at Petrograd, and compare those reports with the reports of Lieut. Commander Crowley he will get the facts. The fact is that this committee is as wholly ignorant of affairs in Russia as is Mr. Francis.

Mr. FLOOD. I am glad the gentleman is in Congress, so that he can enlighten the committee in regard to affairs in Russia.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I appeared before the committee in 1917, and the committee refused to be enlightened, and the committee has not learned anything since.

Mr. FLOOD. Because the committee did not think the gentleman knew anything about what he desired to talk about.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The committee did not know anything about the matter, and were in no position to tell, but the sad feature is that the committee did not wish to be informed.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman thinks he knows it, but I think he will find it hard to get anybody to agree with him on that subject.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think I have the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman must recognize the fact that others, too, accept the gentleman at the value he places upon himself.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has the gentleman read the series of reports of the consul general at Petrograd?

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will be really polite enough to let me answer his question, I will try to answer; but I will not engage in such a discussion as this with the gentleman.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has the gentleman read the reports?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Gentlemen should not speak to Members in the House in the second person, as is now being indulged in.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am sorry. Has the gentleman from Virginia read the reports of the American consul general at Petrograd, written in 1917 and 1918?

Mr. FLOOD. No; I have not; but—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Thank you. Now, has the gentleman from Virginia—

Mr. FLOOD. I do not propose to be questioned by you in this way. If you ask for information, I will endeavor to give it to you.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do want information.

Mr. FLOOD. Very well, then. Sit down and I will give it to you.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have the floor.

Mr. FLOOD. Very well. Keep the floor.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, at the most critical time in the affairs of this country, has said that he has not read the reports of our consul general in Russia or from our naval attaché there, and yet he claims that he is enlightened on affairs in that country. He refuses to answer questions and then says that the committee and he, himself in particular, has all the information and nobody else has it. I call the attention of every Member of this House to the reports of Consul General North Winship at Petrograd, and the naval attaché at Petrograd, and ask them to compare those reports with the reports of Mr. Francis. I have wondered if the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is aware of the fact that our allies had to call the attention of the Department of State to the personal conduct and associations of our ambassador with certain of his friends of Teutonic tendencies. Is the gentleman aware of that?

I appeared before this committee in 1917. There I found not only that the committee was not informed on conditions in Russia, but it absolutely refused to listen. I will ask, now, the chairman—the distinguished chairman—if he can stand up and give us the names of the Provinces of Russia and their capitals and their races, or explain recent political changes there? If he can do that now without going to the Library, I will stand up here and most humbly apologize before this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this is hardly a time to enter into a discussion of Russian affairs. I know that my extremely delightful and accomplished friend from New York is sincere in what he says, but I beg to say that he has not been correctly informed when he says that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has not been giving Russian affairs their attention, because the committee has been given a great deal of light on the situation which recent months have disclosed in Russia. However, by reason of the fact that the war has

been the paramount issue with the world for some time, and that the President of the United States is not only the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy but our constitutionally created spokesman in all our foreign affairs, it has not been deemed advisable, in my judgment, and in that of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to take up a discussion of Russian affairs, either publicly or by the committee.

Very likely the time will soon come, and perhaps is now here, when that can properly be done. Personally I have given many months to the study of this question. I am inclined to believe that perhaps I have given more time during the last year and a half to the study of the Russian question than I have given to any other subject during that same period.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I think the question that was asked by our colleague from Pennsylvania on this line was a very pertinent question, because it does involve the duty of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As I understand from the press dispatches, about \$185,000,000 were loaned out of the \$375,000,000 that had been promised. That money was not sent to Russia—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we over on this side can not hear a word that is being said; but there is plenty of room on that side, and I will go over there and sit and listen.

Mr. FESS. I was asking my colleague a question about the disposition of the money that had been loaned to Russia. As I understood, the money was not sent to Russia, but it was used here to purchase munitions when Russia was really an ally, and as soon as the Russian Government broke and Kerensky fell those supplies that had been sent to Vladivostok were taken over by our own authorities, so that even the \$185,000,000 that was loaned was not entirely in the hands of the Russian people or the Russian Government.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I think myself that the inquiry was entirely pertinent and a very important one. In answer, speaking generally, I think it can be said safely that when the gentleman to whom reference has been made, Mr. Bakhmeteff, was sent here, he was regularly accredited by the then Government, not only de facto but the constitutionally recognized Government of Russia. The Government of Russia at that time had passed beyond the de facto stage in a sense. A revolution had perfected itself and a government stable in character had been formed, Mr. Bakhmeteff was properly accredited to the United States, and as an ambassador, of course, was clothed with the full power to act for that country in the matter of loans and other things. When the Kerensky government fell—if I can use that term—or when the transformation occurred between the Kerensky provisional government and the Soviet government of Russia, chaos naturally resulted at least in the foreign affairs of the Russian Government, and no attempt was ever made by the Soviet government to establish foreign relations with countries generally throughout the world. They did in some instances, but not generally. They never protested against Mr. Bakhmeteff's representation of Russia here. We had received him and recognized him as the proper ambassador from Russia, and we have, in a sense, closed our eyes to the things that have occurred in Russia since then and have continued to recognize him as the existing authority speaking for the Russian people and Russian Government.

This loan to which reference has been made, a very large sum, was intended to pay for supplies purchased in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And while the proper disposition of this fund was taking place, the change which I have referred to occurred between the Kerensky government and the Soviet. Manifestly somebody had to act and did act, and I understand Mr. Bakhmeteff has continued to represent the Russian people. Whether or not the payment of the interest charges on that loan out of the principal is proper is a question of law and not of politics.

Mr. FESS. Is the gentleman informed as to the law on that?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, I have an opinion on that subject, but I would not want to express it here.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to know if my colleague felt free to state what the status of that debt is now, with the Russian Government in the situation in which it finds itself?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Of course we do not recognize any existing government of Russia at the present time. If the gentleman cares for my personal opinion it is this, that that debt

is a debt owed by the Russian people, and we do not care whether they have a Czar, a Kerensky, a Soviet, a President, or a Mikado.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman means that it does not make any difference so far as the payment of this loan is concerned?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; they may have any kind of government they want, and though we Americans may prefer that they enjoy one kind of government rather than another, that which concerns us here is that this debt is owed by the Russian people, and they have got to pay it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The gentleman said he did not care. He means that it does not make any difference.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It does not make any difference as far as the payment of this debt is concerned. They have a right to choose their own form of government, but I am speaking of the repayment of the money that we loaned for the service of the Russian people.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What evidence of indebtedness have we from the Russian Government or the Russian people?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am not in a position to answer the gentleman's inquiry authoritatively, but I am quite confident that the Russian ambassador has given due receipts for the sums loaned and has full authority to perform such an act by reason of his position.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Were there any formal instruments issued, bonds or any evidences of that character?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I am certainly of the opinion that there must have been. The gentleman will recall that some of these loans were made to the old Russian Government when the Czar was on his throne, and the business transaction was carried on by the first Mr. Bakhmeteff, who was ambassador under the régime of the Czar.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I had something else I wanted to say.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I was only going to suggest to the gentleman that the handling of these loans was not in the Department of State, nor does this matter come within the purview of this particular committee to know the full details of it. The loans were made by the Secretary of the Treasury under the powers given by this immediate Congress, and the full information can be obtained from the proper committee, it seems to me, or from the Treasury Department, much more readily than from the State Department, and they are expected to know about it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman's position is well taken in one sense, but in another sense loans from one Government to another are an international matter, having a political significance, and as such come under the jurisdiction of the State Department.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Minnesota permit an interruption?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think it is well within the recollection of all gentlemen on the floor who listened to the debate here shortly after Mr. Bakhmeteff came as representative of the Kerensky government that about \$185,000,000 was loaned to that government through him. While the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] was addressing the House concerning testimony recently given by Secretary McAdoo before the Committee on Appropriations, I asked him specifically what the security was that had been given by Ambassador Bakhmeteff as representative of the Kerensky government for the money that was loaned to Russia by our Government. I asked him in so many words if a bond or any bonds were given. He said no, but what was the equivalent of a demand note signed by Mr. Bakhmeteff, as ambassador representing the Kerensky government, but that nothing in the form of a bond, as I understood it, had been given.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is precisely what every Government gave. We have no bond for security; they are merely notes of hand made by the proper representatives. So that so far as that is concerned the situation is the same in regard to Great Britain and other countries.

The time of Mr. MILLER of Minnesota having expired, he was given five minutes more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is it not true—at least it was so said on the floor by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] in his remarks—that the law authorizing the loaning of this money to the belligerent Governments required these respective Governments to give as security bonds containing substantially the same provisions as were contained in the bonds of the United States Government?

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will pardon me, that was true in regard to the first loan, the 3½ per cent. That was the requirement, but in subsequent loans it was authorized and

not required. The Treasury Department could do it if it saw fit, but as a matter of fact no bonds have been received from any of the foreign Governments.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under which law of authorization were these loans made to Russia, to the Kerensky government?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I imagine it was the first.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. I think there is some confusion here. When the war broke out with Russia there were certain loans floated in this country for Russia through the banks in New York City. These loans were sold to the investing public. What I want to know is whether the subsequent loan made by the Secretary of the Treasury to the new Kerensky government—whether that money was used for the purpose of paying interest on the debt that otherwise would have been defaulted.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I know personally nothing about it, and I can not definitely answer the gentleman's question, but I understand that the principal of the one hundred and eighty-five millions, so called, is being used to pay that interest, but, of course, it is a legal question whether that is proper or not.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I think we can agree that the position of the present Russian ambassador is anomalous and an exceedingly embarrassing one. I suppose he can get no money from Russia, even if the people desired to send it to him. Does the gentleman know whether, in fact, the United States Government pays him for his personal support?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can not speak personally, but my information is that he has subject to his disposal one hundred and eighty-five millions, and that he can provide for his own expenses.

Mr. ROGERS. He can go into the Treasury Department on any morning and say he wants \$1,000 out of his balance?

Mr. RAGSDALE. If the gentleman will permit, the recognition of any foreign ambassador is an executive function. No committee of the House can interfere with it. The sums of money that have been loaned through the Secretary of the Treasury to the foreign governments are entirely controlled by the President of the United States, under the legislation of Congress, and with which no committee can interfere.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for seven minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use these seven minutes speaking somewhat briefly and in general terms only of the Russian situation, and this has been induced by the remarks made by my good friend from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]. The gentleman is undoubtedly correct in the suggestion thrown out in his remarks that our diplomatic representation in Russia during at least a year and a half has not been of the most successful character. I say that as I judge of the work that has been done by the American representatives in Russia.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is it that Gov. Francis did, or failed to do, that you gentlemen are trying to make capital out of?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the Speaker will permit, I was about to come to that point, and, while I do not care to enter into a full discussion of it, I think the honored Speaker of the House will understand my position from what I say. I was about to express this sentiment when interrupted: In respect of this character of representation America does not stand unique among the other nations of the earth. No one can study the diplomatic history of the great Russian people during the past two years and come out of it without knowing that the action of all of the allies, including the United States itself, was just one stupendous blunder after another. In my opinion there does not exist in the history of diplomacy in this century two periods and two places where greater blunders, with more far-reaching consequences, occurred than in Greece and Russia, and in Russia is the worst of the two.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, Ambassador Francis did not have anything to do with Greece.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, I am not criticizing the American ambassador to Russia for anything in Greece.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, what was it that happened in Russia?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will possess his soul in patience—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will possess my soul in patience.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. To quote the gentleman's own estimable language, I will try to enlighten him. I feel embarrassment in speaking too plainly and at all in detail, and I am not going to do it, but I will say this: Mr. Francis, when he landed in Russia, by the associations he made, and they were all innocently formed, and he is perhaps to be forgiven for having made them, was not in a position to be warmly received by the Russian people, who presently took matters into their own hands. He not only had a complete lack of an understanding of the Russian character, and I now speak of the masses of Russian people, but he did not make any effort to understand their character, learn their aspirations, or to cooperate with their democratic movements. Perhaps very likely the environment of our ambassador handicapped him as it did his associates from other countries in this regard. I desire not at this time to enter into a discussion one way or another of the work of Mr. Francis in Russia and simply submit these most general observations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How does the gentleman know all this? And then I would like to ask another question while I am at it. Did not the Hon. Elihu Root come back from over there from that celebrated expedition he made and claim in a public speech that there was no more trouble in Russia than there was in the United States?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, I am not certain Elihu Root ever made that statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I am, if the gentleman is not.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would like further to inquire what has ever been done with the report that Elihu Root made? Nobody outside the executive department has ever seen it or heard of it, and nobody has had a chance to know what it is. Now, if the gentleman will permit, as I can proceed only for a very few minutes, I do not care to enter into anything of a partisan character at all in this, because it is a matter that affects our country as a whole. The fault of the diplomats representing the United States and allied nations in Russia during this terrific period has been this: They have failed to see that the 7 per cent of Russian people heretofore constituting the aristocracy and the governing class, in possession of the land and of wealth and brains, education, culture, and refinement, have ceased to exist, and that the 93 per cent of people who heretofore had never known or found the blessings and privileges of political and economical freedom are now masters of their own fate and should be dealt with as the Russian nation. These diplomatic representatives have clung and are willing to cling to the old wrecked and sinking group of survivors, if you please, of the Czar's régime, and fail to see that the power and blood of Russia is in the masses of Russian people, and until our diplomatic representatives go and meet those people and forget the Czar and his associates and the aristocracy, we will never get on speaking terms and working terms with the Russian people. So I hope it will be understood that I have no special criticism of Mr. Francis, apart from the other diplomatic representatives, for his entire failure to accomplish certain results for which he was sent to labor. But this undoubtedly is true. When Mr. Francis landed in Petrograd he permitted himself to be isolated from the entire Russian situation. I do not like to say that he was filled with fear, I do not like to say that he was filled with hopelessness as to accomplishing anything with the Russian people, but I will say that from the time chaos started at Petrograd—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I have five minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. He might as well have been on the Island of Malta. Perhaps this is no fault of his and may be the fault of the situation. It is necessary that we send to Russia some man of strength with the masses of the Russian people, some man who will make a sympathetic effort to cooperate with democracy there, if we are going to accomplish results. Now, I had prepared some months ago—

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. After a great deal of work a rather elaborate address on the Russian situation. I will yield for a brief interruption.

Mr. LAZARO. Does that mean the Bolsheviks?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; now, the gentleman probably knows about what I think of the Bolsheviks, and what I ought to think of them anyhow.

Mr. LAZARO. What does the gentleman mean by "masses"?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If I had an hour I could certainly express myself fully, but I do not feel disposed to take the time of the committee in such full discussion. I would like to say this, however: Every man conversant with the true condition in Russia knows that the millions there are determined on democracy, and our attitude should be one of sympathy and helpfulness. At the same time I have no sympathy whatever with Lenin, Trotsky, or their Bolshevik insanity. They are betraying their people by their foolish dreams and cruel methods.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. All right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the gentleman has no sympathy with them, who are you going to have sympathy with over there—who is running it?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That, I think, is a pertinent question. In answer to the gentleman I would say this, and I hope I can make my thought clear: There are two great extremes in Russian thought and life in recent times. There is the old aristocracy that is no more, and we all have kissed it goodbye with a smile on our lips. There is the new and the present Bolshevik government in Russia; that is the opposite extreme. It is the final refuge of the mass of mankind, ignorant and improperly led, who are walking to their own destruction. Nothing can justify the conduct of Lenin and Trotsky in their administration of affairs in Russia. But this is true: The great masses of the Russian people when they overthrew the Czar wanted to be fair-minded, to be just, wanted to progress, wanted to be free, wanted to establish a real democracy. They were ignorant and have been misled. I fear the nations of the world did not look upon this great struggling mass of mankind with that sympathetic care they should have done. Foreign diplomats then had been too long accustomed to deal with the old aristocracy to readily take up with the new order of things. Many of them still clung to the hope that somehow out of the chaos the old discarded aristocracy could get back to power. They failed to make the best of the situation, work with this democracy, and endeavor to lead it along a safe pathway. In effect, at least, they abandoned the newly released Russian masses to the radicals and those who cruelly misled them. They left these throngs of people to the vicious German propaganda and to the leadership of extreme radicals. The present deplorable condition of the Russian people, the hundreds of millions that are there, can be charged, first, to their own ignorance; second, to their folly; third, because the civilized nations of the world left them to wallow in the slough of despond.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think that we all use the term "Bolshevism" rather loosely; but if it is what I conceive it to mean, it consists of a number of people who are organized for the purpose of establishing chaos. If we consider it in that light, what portion of the Russian people to-day, would the gentleman say, are really active Bolsheviks?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. A very small per cent.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. LAZARO. Is there a middle class in Russia, in the gentleman's judgment?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Not as we understand the middle class in any other place in the world. The Kerensky government, had it been permitted to continue, in my judgment, would have so changed its character that it would have become a meeting ground of the best elements of the two sides and would have formed the middle class that would have solved the situation, but he made some very vital mistakes, and, of course, the unfortunate propaganda of Germany at that time finished the job. Kerensky sought to keep faith with Russia's allies by restoring the Russian Army to a fighting force. He began this, perhaps, too late. At all events, his efforts to restore discipline resulted in disaster.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. POUL. The gentleman has spoken of Trotsky. I suppose also he has in mind one Lenin.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I also spoke of him.

Mr. POUL. Men can not lead unless other men follow, and, so far as I can judge, we are dealing with a race of people who have followed a set of traitors, and for my part I am opposed to sacrificing a single American boy there.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I indorse exactly the sentiment that we should not sacrifice a single other American boy on Russian soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express this with the strongest conviction of which I am capable: When the aristocracy of Russia was overthrown, nearly two years ago, the mass of the Russian people, as all the world knows, were untutored in politics and political self-government. There had been scattered over the world refugees from Russia, there were thousands in Siberia, there for political crimes. They were not a bad kind at all. They were usually the kind that we in this country have felt a profound sympathy for; but there were Russians in other nations of the world, men who were pure anarchists, who had by their conduct elsewhere in the world drifted entirely away from the sanctity of organized society, away and apart from the real principles of civilization. Among these two Trotsky and Lenin may both be numbered. Lenin was exiled in Switzerland and Trotsky in the United States. Trotsky was identified with ultraradicals in the United States. I am advised that as soon as the world knew of the revolution in Russia these men poured back into Russia from the corners of the earth. More than 100,000 came from distant parts of the earth. These men could speak of other civilizations in a glib and flowing tongue. These men could talk that they had lived in America and knew the American free institutions. They could say they had lived in free Switzerland, that they had lived in republican France, and, therefore, they set themselves up as leaders of the people. The people, gullible in the extreme, were seduced from the pathway of true democracy and led toward crime and disaster. This is the reason, in my judgment, why the masses of the people have been led astray. Russia will in the end achieve her democratic ideals, but the way has been made long and hard by the failure of the allies to save her from her foes within.

Even when Lenin and Trotsky captured the Russian control we should have tried our best to keep up relations with the Russian people, never ceased our efforts to help them to a better condition. Proper work of America and the allies, I feel sure, would have saved Russia from the awful state into which she has fallen.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. FESS. It came to me from a very high source that the Root Commission had recommended the expenditure of a very large sum of money, specified at \$5,000,000, to enter upon an intelligent propaganda in Russia to avoid the danger that Mr. Root himself had announced might appear. I have understood that one member of the commission refused to sign that recommendation. What has become of those recommendations to which the gentleman referred awhile ago without specifying?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not know what has become of them. I should be very glad to answer if I did. In conclusion I would like to indorse the sentiment expressed by my friend from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. I do not believe that we are justified in keeping an American soldier in Russia or Siberia another day, and yet I believe the President did the wise thing when he sent them there at the time. I believe he did the wise thing for many reasons, and I heartily approved of his plan at the time. He was justified in taking that course by reason of international complications of the most stupendous character. I know from what I can gather that he resisted the strongest kind of pressure from some nations in the world to send in there a very large force. To have done this would have been unjustifiable from any decent standpoint. Nothing could justify our entering a world war to save democracy and at the same time sending our boys into Russia to shoot democracy out of the Russian people. There were reasons justifying the sending of a few troops there at that time. It was a dangerously delicate situation, and before a man was sent the masses, the people, should have known that the coming of our soldiers contained no menace to their democracy.

In my judgment the one great impelling reason for sending in our men was that within the confines of the Russian Empire were the Czecho-Slovaks, whose deeds during the last year and a half form a page in heroism, sacrifice, and suffering that has no parallel since men marched under the crusaders' cross to the Holy Land. And I was in favor of sending these men to Russia, although I knew it was fraught with danger to our relations with the Russian people. I wanted those men to go

that we might aid those Czecho-Slovaks, whom money could not buy nor threats frighten, heroic souls who crossed desert lands and frozen steppes, forests, and icy streams, starved, naked, bleeding, and dying, that they might again have liberty for their country. And he whose eye stretches back through the centuries to 1648, when their country lost its liberty, can well say in his heart that their country may have lost its independence but their people never lost their heroic spirit, and while they live it is the duty of Americans, who love freedom and liberty, to help them at any cost. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. After listening to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] and being told what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] said I think the best thing to do would be to constitute them the entire peace congress at Paris and let them settle this thing right off the bat themselves. [Applause.]

I hold no brief for Ambassador David Rowland Francis. These gentlemen bring general, nebulous charges against him. They should be more specific. What did he do that the representatives of other great powers did not do or what did he fail to do that the representatives of these other great powers failed not to do? The truth is that there is not a man on earth who knows really what is going on in Russia. With 180,000,000 people, divided into about 30 or 35 or 40 nationalities, each one of them at the other's throats, all that those ambassadors over there, Francis among them, could do was to take care of their own people as well as they could.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] suggests that Gov. Francis ought to have gone on an electioneering campaign in order to have gotten acquainted with the Russian people. Would he not have been in a beautiful condition had he undertaken a thing like that? It is the law of the world, the international law or custom, that representatives of a country in other countries shall attend to their own business and not mix up with other people's affairs. President Cleveland sent an English ambassador back from here for doing that identical thing. George Washington sent a Frenchman home because he persisted in doing it; President Wilson did the same; and the public opinion of the United States has indorsed all three of them in what they did. I have no sort of doubt that others have departed from our shores upon private intimations to their Governments that they were persona non grata here.

I am going to tell you just a little about Francis; not much. The gentleman intimated that maybe Francis was afraid. Let me tell you something. A man born in Kentucky and raised in Missouri is not afraid of the devil himself. [Applause.] He started in as a clerk in a St. Louis commission house when he was a boy. He got to be the biggest commission merchant in St. Louis. He was made mayor of that great city. He was elected governor of that imperial Commonwealth. He was a member of Cleveland's Cabinet. And there is not a man living who can assert that in any of those high positions he ever failed to do his duty and his whole duty. [Applause.]

He is a man of splendid capacity and high character. While I do not know what he did in Russia, and neither does the gentleman from Minnesota nor the gentleman from New York, it is to be presumed that a man with that kind of record would do what he ought to do. Whether he is a skillful diplomat I do not know. Not being much of a diplomat, I do not profess to be a judge of diplomats. I will, however, state that Ambassador Francis has as much common sense as any other man in the Diplomatic Service. My own opinion is that if Kerensky had called a constituent assembly as soon as he got in power over there they might have a settled government at this time. But he did nothing of the sort. That Russia will some day have a free and stable government we all hope and pray. The road, however, to freedom is long and tortuous; more is the pity. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is a man a good deal above the average intelligence, even in the House of Representatives, and he ought to know, and he does know, that France, starting out under almost exactly the same circumstances as Russia, took almost a hundred years to gain a settled government.

In 1789 they had a Bourbon King, and they chopped his head off. Then they had a committee of safety, which they soon kicked out. Then came the Reign of Terror—Robespierre and his bloody gang. Then they had a directory. Then came Napoleon, with his consulate and empire for 15 years. The Bourbons then came back and stayed until 1830, lacking 100 days of the Waterloo campaign. Then Louis Philippe was inducted into

office. He stayed 18 years. The second Republic was established; Louis Napoleon was elected President, and stabbed it to death in the house of its friends. Then came the second Empire for 18 years. After that they had the Commune for some months. Then they established the third Republic, which, thank God, seems to be founded on a rock. [Applause.] I would not be at all surprised if Russia goes through as long a revolutionary period as that. An established free government will be worth all it costs in blood, life, and treasure, if the revolution does go on for a hundred years. Of course, we hope their revolutionary period will be shorter.

I suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York that they could be in a great deal better business than backcapping the American ambassador to Russia. [Applause.] Suppose that he was to take their criticisms to heart and resign—which he will not do, if he has half as much sense as I think he has—but suppose he did, and President Wilson wanted to send another ambassador to Russia, to what Government would he accredit him? You have to have a government to which to accredit an ambassador or a minister, and they have none in Russia, except the one that Trotsky and Lenine have established, which is bitterly opposed. They may take it into their heads, so far as I know, those two remarkable men, to really make a republic over there. It can not be done in a day.

The governor of Missouri offered the Senatorship to Gov. Francis. He could not accept it because of the fact that if he resigned there was nobody to accredit an ambassador to.

Then Gov. Gardner offered it to me, and I stayed here with you gentlemen because of the love that this House manifested to me time and time again, and which I fully reciprocate. [Applause.]

I am in favor of bringing every American soldier out of Russia. [Applause.] I will tell you what else I am in favor of. I am in favor of bringing every American soldier out of Europe. [Applause.]

A few weeks ago Gen. du Pont, who made more money selling powder for this war than you could stack up in this room in \$1 bills, gave out an interview in New York, in which he said we would have to keep our soldiers over there for two years; one year to tear down the barbed-wire fences and entanglements. We did not put up those barbed-wire fences and entanglements over there, and if the Belgians and French do not want those barbed-wire fences to stay up they will not let them stay up. They are not going to let them stay up, because the metal in those fences is worth millions of dollars, and my observation is that a Belgian or Frenchman never lets a good coin escape him if he can grab hold of it.

Somebody else suggests that we ought to keep them over there to police Europe. After we defeated the Germans for them, they surely ought to police Europe themselves, because there is no doubt but that the sending of our Army over there was what gave them the victory. I was willing for my boy, as every man in this House was for his, to go over there and help them fight, but I am not willing to have my boy stay and have his life work interfered with to tear down wire fences or be a policeman. [Applause.] Among the many wise things President Wilson has said in Europe, the most sensible thing, according to my judgment, is that he intimated to those people over there a week or two ago that he was going to bring those soldiers there back home.

So far as the American ambassador is concerned, I will stand by him, because he has been accredited over there by the chief of Americans now living, and I think gentlemen would naturally praise our American representatives abroad.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I can get time.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did the gentleman gather that I was making any criticism of Mr. Francis or other ambassadors abroad?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know what you were doing if you did not do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I was trying to avoid it, and if I did not avoid it, it was because it is impossible to speak of him and still avoid it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman ought to give specifications. I think Francis, like every other man on earth, ought to answer for his duties.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I will say to the gentleman that I tried my best to express in general terms my own personal views, based on such personal information as I could get, and I will say to the gentleman that I got a whole lot of it in Europe and some of it here, in general terms, such as would not subject Mr. Francis to personal criticism, and if the gentle-

man thinks I have criticized Mr. Francis he is at liberty to do so, but I assure him that I tried my level best to speak of the Russian situation so that no personal criticism could be made to apply to Mr. Francis or our ambassadors.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask you this question: How did you get it into your head that you knew what would happen over there in those countries more than those ambassadors did? [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, that is a very pertinent question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But that is not anything that I ever had in my head.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You talked that way.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I may have differed with them with respect to their work and the propriety of the work that was done there, but I never assumed to say that I knew more about the situation in Russia than the ambassadors of foreign Governments there. But I think that the viewpoint that I secured from the information that was given me was better than their viewpoint, and it is the viewpoint now held, including that of those ambassadors themselves.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear these gentlemen all the time, but when are we going to get down to business and pass the appropriation bills?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. WINGO. Has not the gentleman already spoken on this Russian business?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I did make the criticism that the distinguished Speaker referred to.

Mr. WINGO. I think we ought to get down to business, but I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, it was I who made the criticism of Mr. Francis, and I think I owe it to the distinguished Speaker to give the specifications and particulars he requests. Now, if Mr. Francis was born in Kentucky and raised in Missouri and is fearless, I was born in New York and was raised in Arizona, and I am not afraid to answer. [Applause.]

I do not agree with the distinguished Speaker that Mr. Francis did as much or as little as the diplomatic representatives of the allied countries. My first point to the bill of particulars is this, that Mr. Francis did not work in accord and in sympathy and in harmony with the diplomatic representatives of France and England, and did not cooperate with them. He did not even advise with them judging from his action. All of that is a matter of record in the State Department.

My point No. 2 on Mr. Francis is this, that Mr. Francis in the beginning was not in sympathy with the revolution in Russia, and when the revolution did take place and there was a de facto government established, Mr. Francis did not familiarize himself with the conditions in Russia, and his reports to the State Department will bear me out that he did not have accurate information. The distinguished Speaker says neither did anybody else. Yes; the answer is the British and French ambassadors advised their Governments correctly and so did our consul general at Petrograd, North Winship, and our naval attaché at Petrograd, Lieut. Commander Crowley. They reported to the State Department and to the Navy Department, and their reports are a matter of record. Both of those gentlemen, I will say to the distinguished Speaker, informed this Government that Kerensky could not hold the Government. They knew he was misleading our ambassador. They knew he was not sincere in his effort to keep the army in fighting condition at the front. Kerensky was weak and did not have the courage of his convictions, and they knew he was going to play into the hands of the mob.

We would have no business interfering with the internal affairs of Russia under normal conditions, as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri stated. At that time, however, we were engaged in war, and we had an interest in keeping the eastern front intact, and both Winship and Crowley informed our Government that the eastern line would break, and that we would lose the entire eastern front, thereby releasing 50 or 60 divisions of German and Austrian soldiers to be used at the other fronts, if Kerensky continued unchecked in power. You all remember that shortly after Kerensky took possession,

or was in power, there was a conflict within the Russian Government as to abolishing the death penalty for desertion. That was the first break in the Kerensky government. One faction claimed that with the establishment of the republic only such soldiers should serve as wanted to stay at the front, and that all punishments for desertion should be abolished. Now, any man could see that no Russian soldier was going to stay on the eastern front unless he had to.

Kerensky at first opposed this. He was, as you will recall, the minister of war. After his inspection at the front, when, as you will also remember, he fraternized with the soldiers, entirely ignoring commands and the officers, encouraging the formation of company and regimental committees, he returned to Petrograd with new ideas. He then lined up in favor of the abolition of the death penalty for desertion. France and England seem to have known this from their ambassadors. Our consul general at Petrograd and our naval attaché knew it, and they reported it. You will find, gentlemen, that our ambassador failed entirely to report actual existing conditions on this point. You will all recall the anxious moments in Russia pending the decision of this vital question. Gen. Korniloff was opposed to Kerensky and did everything within reason to convince Kerensky that everything would crumble unless the army was maintained and the eastern front held. It became a fight between Kerensky and Korniloff. France and England backed Korniloff, because Korniloff would have kept the army on the eastern front, but, I am informed, on Mr. Francis's report to the Department of State we backed Kerensky and backed the wrong horse. Not only did we do that, I will say to the distinguished Speaker, but we brought pressure to bear upon our allies, and they were guided by our judgment.

The distinguished Speaker of this House spoke about the Root Commission. The Root Commission did not have full information. They were in Russia for only a few weeks. They could not grasp the situation in that time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did they not get it? That is what they were sent over there for.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; I personally do not consider the work of that commission a howling success. They spent two weeks in getting from Vladivostok to Petrograd. Take that out of the time that they were away and you will see that they did not have the opportunity to carefully observe conditions or carefully size up men. Was that not the duty of our ambassador? Should he not have intimate knowledge of the various men then in power? If Mr. Francis had worked in harmony and cooperated with his colleagues, the British and French ambassadors, or if he had been willing to listen to his own subordinates, Consul General Winship and Commander Crowley—two keen, bright, able, energetic Americans—he would not have permitted the Root Commission to see but one side of the picture. I believe Kerensky fooled Mr. Root and the whole commission, the same as he did Mr. Francis himself. Why, to give you an idea, in order to get a "Socialist" audience for the Socialist representative of the commission, Mr. Russell, I am told that Mrs. Pankhurst got up a meeting of servant girls working in families of the Petrograd aristocracy who were brought to the ballroom of one of the fashionable hotels by their mistresses to listen to Mr. Russell's lecture. They knew no English; he knew no Russian. If this is a sample of the direct contact and communication with the people of Russia can you imagine what sort of information must be filed in the archives of the American Embassy in Russia?

Mr. IGOE. Whom did Mr. Root address when he was over there?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Who was it that gave this information to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. North Winship, our consul general to Russia, and Commander Crowley.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman tell us where they gave him that information?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly. After North Winship put in these reports Mr. Francis said, "I don't want this man here," and he was recalled.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Which man?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. North Winship.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Where did they inform the gentleman from New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am coming to that. Commander Crowley was recalled. I saw North Winship at Milan, Italy. He is our consul there now, and I saw Commander Crowley at Madrid, Spain. He is our naval attaché there, and I personally interviewed him on the subject.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Will the gentleman permit a further interruption?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Anything.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Did the gentleman at that time advise the State Department of the information he had and as to the very poor handling of our foreign affairs in Russia?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Why, certainly not. It was too late then. Everything was over as far as the front went. Our good men had been recalled. I had all I could do holding down the job I then had on my hands. Past experience had taught me that the Department of State did not desire information of that kind. The reports I referred to were all sent to the department.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. As I understood the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] he thought this Government failed in not upholding Kerensky.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. There seems to be a difference of opinion between the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I can not go into the details of that with the gentleman. Perhaps he misunderstood the gentleman from Minnesota.

Why, gentlemen, these very conflicts of opinion, all this lack of information, is proof positive that this House is not in possession of the facts, and from what source are this House and other departments of our Government to get information if not from our diplomatic representatives abroad? This Mr. Francis failed to do.

I agree with what has been said on the floor to-day and repeated many times during the past weeks that our Army should return home. We have accomplished our task. I am glad to hear that the distinguished Speaker says that they will soon all be on their way back. I hope that no time will be lost in getting all of our troops out of Russia. No matter how careful or tactful we may be in our conduct of these troops in Russia, we are bound to get mixed up in the factional fights now going on in that unhappy country. Even in endeavoring to preserve order, are we not liable to play into the hands of one of the factions? And would it not be most embarrassing to us and our purpose in this war and our ideals if in the course of preserving order in absolute good faith we were to indirectly assist in the Romanoff dynasty or other undesirable dynasty again placing itself in possession of Russia and her people? [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] criticizes the Committee on Foreign Affairs for not hearing him on the Russian question, and he intimates that they do not know much about the Russian situation. I do not care to discuss that situation to-day. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. He has demonstrated to this House certainly that some members of the committee are familiar with the Russian situation, whether their conclusions in reference to that situation are correct or not. The other members of that committee are sufficiently well posted on Russian affairs not to desire to hear the gentleman from New York.

But I do want to say this in reference to the statement made here and the intimations thrown out about our ambassador to Russia. I had a talk with the Assistant Secretary of State sometime ago in reference to this gentleman. I had heard these rumors which have been hinted at to-day as to the delinquencies of Ambassador Francis, and I took up the matter with the Assistant Secretary of State, whose business it is to keep posted on these matters and who had these consular reports before him, who was fully aware of everything that was said in the consular reports referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], who had all the rumors brought here by people who had traveled in Russia and those who had not traveled in Russia about Ambassador Francis, and he said this: That Ambassador Francis was one of the most efficient diplomatic representatives we had in the service [applause], and the very strongest intellect and character in the diplomatic service in Russia during this period of unrest. [Applause.] He said that Ambassador Francis was the one man around whom all the other representatives of the allied powers gathered for advice and for strength, and that he was the most active diplomatic representative in Russia; that he was everywhere that one man could possibly be as long as his health held out. But when his health broke down his little home was the place at which the other representatives in Russia from the nations with whom we had been associated in the war gathered for advice and support. The only criticism that he ever heard made against Mr. Francis that was supported by investigation made by the State Department was that when he first went to Russia he did not live in the magnificent style that the Russian people and the nobility desired him to live in; that he traveled around Petrograd in a Ford car instead of a

Pierce-Arrow, and lived in moderate quarters, quarters that did not appeal to the wealthy people of Russia, and they criticized him for that, because he did not keep up the style they expected and desired him to. That was the only criticism by people who really know Russia and the Russian situation. I wanted to say this in defense of a man who has made great sacrifices for his country and for civilization. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, records, and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several embassies and legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, repairs, postage, telegrams, furniture, typewriters, including exchange of same, messenger service, compensation of kavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreters, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, San Francisco, and New Orleans, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of embassies and legations, and for printing in the Department of State, and for loss on bills of exchange to and from embassies and legations, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$1,300,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have scanned very closely the usually illuminating report of the committee on this bill, and under this item I find this information: Appropriation for 1919, \$1,105,585; estimate for 1920, \$1,200,000; amount recommended, \$1,300,000. Here is quite an unusual increase that has no explanation except the bare figures as carried in the appropriation bill or in the estimates on this bill. I rise in all seriousness of purpose to ascertain the reason why the committee granted \$100,000 more than the estimate, and the bill carrying nearly \$300,000 more than the current appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. The committee did add \$100,000 to this item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me say that the report states it as \$1,105,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; the report embraces the deficiency; that is, the Diplomatic and Consular bill carried \$1,005,000. The Appropriations Committee, in a deficiency bill, added another \$100,000, making \$1,105,000. The State Department asked that that be increased to \$1,200,000, because there would be an increase in the telegraph service caused by the greatly increased business that would come after the final settlement at the peace table.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I notice in the hearings that the sum expended last year out of this appropriation was \$700,000 for cable tolls. Is it not a fact that during the next year, on account of the great activity of that line of work, a greater sum will be needed?

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman anticipate that during the fiscal year beginning July 1 there will be such activity in the use of the cable as would require a larger appropriation?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes; more in the State Department.

Mr. ROGERS. In the hearings, Mr. Carr—page 82—states that the total appropriation for 1918 was \$1,180,000; was that a slight error?

Mr. FLOOD. No; \$1,105,000 is correct.

Mr. ROGERS. So that the appropriation asked for is an increase—

Mr. STAFFORD. The appropriation for 1919 is \$1,105,585—

Mr. ROGERS. I am referring to 1918. The recommendation in this bill contains, as the gentleman will observe, only a very small increase over that appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I direct the gentleman's attention, because he has called attention minutely to these appropriations, that there was only expended in 1918, regardless of the appropriation, \$1,034,000. That was last year, ending June 30 last. So we are appropriating nearly \$300,000 for the expense of this service for the next fiscal year over what was expended in the last fiscal year, a very considerable increase.

Mr. FLOOD. What I was going on to say was that the State Department is not responsible for all of this increase. The Committee on Foreign Affairs, without any suggestion from the State Department, did add \$100,000 to it. The opinion from the State Department was that the telegraphic service during the year 1920, owing to the creation of new countries, the establishment of new embassies and legations, would be probably greater than it had ever been before, and therefore they asked for a small amount more than they got for the current year from our committee and the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs went further and added \$100,000. A hundred thousand dollars was added in order that it might be applied to rent. The gentleman will observe that some of the money can be used where necessary for rent, and we thought it was wise to aid our representatives in the most expensive capitals with an allowance for rent, or, rather, to make an appropriation that would enable the State Department

to do so. The committee really had in mind that the department might supply some of these ambassadors at these high-priced places with means with which to rent dwellings. That may not meet with the gentleman's approval, but that is what the committee had in mind, and that is why the committee added the \$100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is indulging in a policy that is somewhat unique and exceptional in the legislation of the House. Without any information whatsoever, based largely on surmise, they increased the estimate of the appropriation \$100,000. The amount that was expended from this appropriation last year was \$1,034,000. The department only asked for \$1,200,000, and yet the committee goes ahead in these times when money is scarce in this country and increases it deliberately \$100,000 without a word of testimony. I have scanned the brief testimony of about a page upon this item, and not a word is said by the distinguished gentleman from the State Department who appeared to explain the estimate as to there being any need for any additional amount. That is an indication of Democratic economy—not to curtail the appropriation, not to give them the full amount, but to give them \$100,000 more, based upon a pure surmise on the part of some of the members of the committee that they could use it by employing it in some other way.

Mr. FLOOD. No; not in some other way.

Mr. STAFFORD. In some other ways than were contemplated by the department, because if the department had in mind the expenditure of this money they would have increased the estimate. I think it is something so out of the ordinary to indulge in this practice in these times when the Treasury is in such need of money, and the public will be called upon continually to reimburse the Treasury for these expenditures, that we are at least warranted in insisting that it be no more than the amount carried in the estimate. Therefore I move to reduce the amount from \$1,300,000 to \$1,200,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 7, line 8, strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,200,000."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not take this action without due consideration, and it was not Democratic extravagance, because the Democratic and Republican members of the committee voted alike. The State Department came before the committee with a suggestion to increase the salaries of our ambassadors from \$17,500 to \$25,000 a year. The committee voted it down. Some years ago this appropriation was increased for the purpose of allowing the State Department to give a contingent fund to the different large embassies in Europe, and I think at London the amount apportioned was \$15,000. That item was increased for that purpose at that time by Congress, and the gentleman from Wisconsin, the watchdog of the Treasury, voted for it. That word "rent" was put in this item, authorizing the State Department to permit the use of this money for rent, and the appropriation was increased. The demands upon this fund became so enormous for cablegrams and other expenditures that probably none of it was left that could be utilized for this purpose. The committee, realizing that fact, added this \$100,000, so that some of this money could be used to pay the rent at these places where rent is so high and where living is so expensive. The committee submits that to the House, believing that we ought to do something to democratize the embassies at the great capitals of Europe. The situation has been for years and is now that a man of small means, if he accepts one of these places at all, does it at the sacrifice of his personal fortune. I believe I can state—because it was stated here yesterday on the floor—that our present ambassador to Great Britain will go there to serve his country and will stay there just as long as his means will permit him to remain. When the fortune which he has accumulated in the forty-odd years of his life is exhausted in the expenses of that position, he will have to come home. This should not be. This will enable the State Department to help the able and efficient men, without great fortunes, who go to these places to pay the enormous rents they have to pay. The rent that is paid by our ambassador to France to-day is \$12,000. If he did not have a lease of that house, if he should go out and another ambassador should walk in, the rent would be \$18,000, and that would be \$500 more than the entire salary of the ambassador to that country. I hope this item may be left as the committee reported it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item was increased \$100,000, and, as I understood it, at the time there was a strong recommendation by the department for an increase of the salaries of certain ambassa-

dors and ministers; in fact, the salaries of the Diplomatic Service all down the line. So far as I was concerned, I felt that salaries in certain sections of the world ought to be increased, because expenses had so very materially increased, but I felt at the same time that expenses in certain other parts of the world had not increased sufficiently to make these large increases of salary necessary. It seemed to me, therefore, that to increase this contingent fund, so that the department could help out the man who was in an expensive section of the world, and not be compelled to increase where the cost of living had not gone so high, would be the wise thing to do. It was my belief that this \$100,000 would enable them to level over the matter, to help the man who needed to be helped, and not be compelled to use it to help others who did not need it. Then I realized also the fact that if you once increase the salaries, no matter how much expenses might go down, you could never lessen them. In this matter you could lessen this amount or not give it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the \$700,000 post fund that was carried in the existing bill was for the express purpose of providing equalization of salaries occasioned by the high cost of living.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That, I think, the gentleman will find is largely for the Consular Service.

Mr. FLOOD. It is also in the Diplomatic Service, but it does not apply to ambassadors and ministers. It applies to clerks, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman for some information. A few moments ago it was stated that the United States had recognized a Russian ambassador. I wanted to ask the chairman of the committee if that is a fact?

Mr. FLOOD. What I said was that the ambassador from Russia, who is here now, came as the representative of the Kerensky government, and we did receive him and recognize him, and he is still acting as Russian ambassador; and we recognize no other diplomatic representative from Russia except Bakhmeteff, who came as representative of the Kerensky government, and has been recognized by the United States Government as the representative here of Russia.

Mr. McFADDEN. At the present time he is the accredited representative of Russia in this country?

Mr. STAFFORD. So far as our Government is concerned.

Mr. McFADDEN. Just another question. I recollect that prior to our entry into the war there were various amounts of Russian loans floated in this country, to the extent of several millions. I also remember the administration, just prior to the sending of the Kerensky representative here, advanced certain moneys—several hundred million dollars—to the Russian government. Do I understand that Mr. Bakhmeteff has charge of these funds as the accredited representative of the Kerensky government or what government?

Mr. FLOOD. He had charge of them. Most of those funds were paid out in this country for obligations the Russian government owed in this country. But the dealing with those funds was done through Mr. Bakhmeteff.

Mr. McFADDEN. I understand that when trouble broke out in Russia there was something like \$180,000,000 of these funds on deposit here, and out of these funds the interest on all the former Russian loans was being paid. Is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. Up to the fall of the Kerensky government we had advanced Russia over \$187,000,000. What was left of that fund when the Kerensky government fell was used to pay obligations due in this country by Russia.

Mr. McFADDEN. Is that how the interest on these foreign loans is being paid?

Mr. FLOOD. The Russian loans?

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FLOOD. From this source and from other funds which the representatives from Russia had here.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. May I inquire if these Russian loans to which reference has been made and attention has been directed are loans made by the United States to the Russian Government or loans by private individuals?

Mr. FLOOD. I presumed the gentleman was speaking of the loans that the United States Government made to the Russian Government.

Mr. McFADDEN. I was speaking first of the various loans made by banking interests in New York and now held by American investors, and then I was speaking in reference to this fund that was advanced by the United States as an additional loan. When the troubles came over there and when the original Rus-

sian Government fell this money seemed to be here and flowing, with no one in charge of it, and since that time we recognized Kerensky. I have wondered upon what authority the Russian ambassador was administering that fund and how he had the right to pay the interest on these loans which were sold to individual investors in this country by these New York banking interests.

Mr. FLOOD. Simply by authority of the fact that he had possession of it, having received it for the Kerensky government, for whom it was intended by our Government.

Mr. McFADDEN. Yes. I wondered, in that connection, whether the United States itself should not properly control that fund.

Mr. FLOOD. I should think this Government loaned it to the Russian Government, but I will get further information and will put it in the Record to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. McFADDEN. I shall be glad.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSPORTATION OF DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR OFFICERS IN GOING TO AND RETURNING FROM THEIR POSTS.

To pay the actual and necessary expenses of transportation and subsistence under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of diplomatic and consular officers and clerks in embassies, legations, and consulates and their families and effects in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under orders of the Secretary of State, but not including any expense incurred in connection with leaves of absence, \$145,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph just read. Last year, as I recall, the House increased the rate of mileage that might be paid for traveling expenses for the diplomatic and consular officers from 5 cents to 10 cents a mile. Now the gentleman proposes to eliminate the limitation entirely, so that there may be paid any amount for expenses of travel, covering their actual expenses it is true, and it further provides for the payment of their subsistence during the time they are traveling and also for the expenses of the transportation for their families and effects. I think there should be some explanation of this radical departure, in this instance, from the limitation which has heretofore been carried on the expenditure of this item.

Mr. FLOOD. This item is unchanged from what it is in the current law—

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. FLOOD. This item is the same as in the current law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I beg to inform the gentleman that it is changed.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not mean the amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not mean the amount; I mean the language.

Mr. FLOOD (reading)—

To pay the actual and necessary expenses of transportation under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, of diplomatic and consular officers and clerks in embassies, legations, and consulates in going to and returning from their posts, or when traveling under orders of the Secretary of State, at the rate of not exceeding 10 cents per mile, but not including any expense incurred in connection with leaves of absence, \$125,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will compare that language with the language carried in the bill, he will see it is changed in several particulars. The limitation on the amount for reimbursement for mileage is eliminated, and next provision is made for the Government paying for their subsistence—

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And then you provide for an allowance to be expended for their families and effects in going to and returning from their posts.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is right. We did make very radical changes. I thought we made those changes in the current law last year, but I see it is in the present bill. They were made upon representation of the hardships that these officers sustained under the laws as we have been enacting.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, last year the committee came before the House and asked as a warrant for increasing the mileage from 5 to 10 cents that it was necessary that the diplomatic and consular officers should have that amount of pay for their mileage. We did so. Now the gentleman seeks to eliminate that and goes further and provides for their subsistence and also for the transportation of their families and effects.

Mr. FLOOD. As I said, I thought we made those changes last year. The State Department urged them very strongly last year, and we raised the mileage from 5 to 10 cents. Now, the statement made to the committee is this:

Mr. CARR. Ten cents a mile in a majority of cases—the flat 10 cents a mile—would, for the officer himself, I think, in practically every case be adequate. But the 10 cents a mile would not be adequate to reimburse the officer for the transportation of himself and members of his family, plus his personal effects, which, of course, have to go with him.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. A departure in that respect is proposed?

Mr. CARR. A departure in that respect is proposed; it has been recommended for a year or so, and is now recommended again.

Mr. MILLER. Then you have also added the words in lines 19 and 20 on page 7, "and their families and effects."

Mr. CARR. We added that last year and the year before, I think. Congress did not receive it favorably, but they did raise the mileage from 5 to 10 cents a mile, with the qualification I have mentioned. The practical working of the transportation appropriation is perhaps better illustrated by some examples I could give you.

Two consuls were transferred from Swatow to Chungking in China. The cost for two officers was \$435 and \$355 Mexican, respectively. Both of those officers were unmarried. They took no account of the cost of transporting or the disposition of their household goods; that is, the cost of disposing of the goods at the old post and acquiring a new outfit at the new post. They received from the Government \$293 and \$173 Mexican, respectively. I do not know what the reason for the difference in the expenses, but whatever it may have been, in one case the man spent \$435 and the Government gave him \$293, and in the other case the man spent \$355 and the Government gave him \$173. They lost the amount of the difference in obeying the order of the Government in making the transfer.

Mr. MILLER. This was during the last year, when the 10 cents a mile prevailed?

Mr. CARR. I have not the date of it. That was before the rise in exchange.

Mr. STAFFORD. They always wish to be freed from any limitation on expenditures placed there by the Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. No; I think it was to enable them actually to reimburse the officers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, Mr. Carr, even in the case instanced, did not know whether all these officers were proceeding under the 5-cent rate or the 10-cent rate; very likely the 5-cent rate, because the 10-cent rate was granted only a year ago.

Mr. FLOOD. Under the old rate it was stated they could not possibly move their families with them without going to extraordinary expense; but my recollection is he cited a great many cases of very great hardship, and the committee thought it wise to except these commissions and—

Mr. STAFFORD. This fund also provides for a transportation charge when the consular and diplomatic officers return home from their posts?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; going and returning.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman realize there should be some limitation on the amount of expenditure per mile?

Mr. FLOOD. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact, in reference to nearly all the items of expense that commissions and individuals can charge against the Government, that the committee in this bill has provided for an itemized statement. I do not mean it has done that in so many words, but it has made the appropriation so they have to itemize these expenditures.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is the language to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. FLOOD. For instance, this international commission that settles disputes between this country and Canada. They now under this amendment get \$8 a day, but we fixed the language so that they have to render an itemized statement of what they do expend. Up to that time they got \$8 a day whether they expended it or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no such requirement in this provision under consideration?

Mr. FLOOD. I think the provision carries that idea.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And it says that the expenditures are to be under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, and of course they will have a proper method of accounting.

I sincerely trust the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. If the chairman will permit me to make an addition to that which he has so strongly presented, I wish to say that one thing that was very persuasive to the committee was this, that our consular and diplomatic officers are traveling for the greater part outside of the United States. They are also traveling from one country to another. When a person is traveling in continental North America he can take a train and go to his destination and if he has to change cars it consumes only an hour or two hours to do so. It is stated that in many of these transfers in China and Japan and elsewhere, where means of communication are not numerous, and they have to go over certain routes part by rail and part by boat, and that often occurs at least during these troubled times, when passenger service is demoralized the world over, a man will have to stop at a hotel waiting for a boat, and the boat, instead of sailing on an appointed day, will not sail for a week or longer. Under existing law his expenses at the hotel during that time of waiting he has to pay himself, as his 10 cents per mile does not give him enough to pay for such long stops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The 10 cents a mile which was allowed in the bill last year will not take care of the most of that. We do not appropriate any more than we did last year. We appropriate the same sum, but it will give flexibility and elasticity to this particular kind of service. I would like to urge this on the gentleman's attention, as one interested in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and who has visited countries in most sections of the world, that the greatest need we have, in my mind, now, to get adequate commercial and political representation in these lands, is to provide sufficient money to enable the force in the field to live. They can not live now on the amount they are getting. I know in my own experience of a number of the most brilliant young men who have entered the Consular Service, who were getting before they entered three or four thousand dollars a year, and who entered it, say, at \$1,800 or \$2,000, and then were obliged to go to Chile, South America, or to Shanghai, China, or into Siberia, and they could not possibly get sufficient money out of their transportation to pay the expenses of their journey there and that of their wives and families. And possibly after three or four years it was found that that particular man was the exact man they wanted in Stockholm, and who if at Stockholm would be of incalculable value to the Government, and they ordered him there. That is a long jump, and the old provision did not give sufficient money to pay his expenses, and men have been quitting the service by reason of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Five cents a mile was not adequate, and so Congress on the recommendation of the committee increased it to 10 cents.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. And 10 cents, in many instances, is more than adequate—perhaps in a majority of cases it is more than adequate—and in many cases, and those the most deserving, it is not adequate, and the department simply asks, not for a greater amount but that it be made more flexible to enable them to take care of it. Certainly the salaries of our consular and diplomatic agents are low enough, usually ridiculously low, and we must pay the actual expenses incident to their necessary travel.

Mr. STAFFORD. You are asking for \$20,000 more than appropriated last year.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman allow me to read a sentence or two from the hearings?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be glad to be informed on the subject.

Mr. ROGERS. I want to read from the testimony of Mr. Herbert C. Hengstler, of the State Department, who is chief of the Consular Bureau. While Mr. Wilbur J. Carr is director of the Consular Service, Mr. Hengstler in his work comes more directly in contact with the subject suggested by the reservation of the point of order.

On page 17 of the hearings he says:

One of the difficulties here that we have experienced is that the present law requires a very complicated system of accounting. In the first place, we have to keep the accounts according to mileage, and, in the second place, we must have another account showing the actual expenses, so that for each trip the consular officer has to render two separate accounts, making a very complicated and cumbersome system.

And then, dropping down a few sentences:

Even 10 cents a mile at the present time frequently does not cover the necessary expenses of the consul himself. One man sent to Russia recently had to spend almost \$900 to take himself and his family to his post. Even if he had gotten 10 cents a mile you could realize he would have received but a small portion of this amount from the Government.

We had a man who was sent a very short distance in Turkey. He had to go overland. I think he got about \$50 mileage, as I recall. His actual expenses were almost \$200. That is the reason we ask for this change in the bill.

Now, I submit to the gentleman from Wisconsin that if we are to keep the kind of Consular Service the needs of this country and the dignity of this country demand, it must be a flexible and an attractive service. We must enable the State Department to send a man from one post to another post whenever the requirements of the service make it proper to have the transfer made. It is not fair and it is not a thing that will appeal to the right sort of man in the Consular Service, if he has to pay hundreds of dollars out of his own pocket in order to move himself and his family to the new post. This does not give him a cent for himself. It simply pays his expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts whether it is the practice now under existing regulations to pay the expenses of travel for the families of our diplomatic and consular officers?

Mr. ROGERS. It has been recommended by the committee for several years.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is not in the present paragraph. It is not in existing law. I wish to have the attention of the chairman. It is, of course, new legislation on this appropriation bill. I now wish to inquire whether under the existing language it is the practice to pay the expenses of the families of these officers?

Mr. ROGERS. I think not.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will direct the inquiry to the gentleman from Virginia as to whether it is the existing practice for the department to pay the expenses of travel for the families of the diplomatic and consular officers?

Mr. FLOOD. The change in this law is for the purpose of enabling the department to do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I have the right to infer from the gentleman's statement that it is not the existing practice?

Mr. FLOOD. They can not do it, as I understand.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman permit? The practice always has been, as far as I know, that they permit a man when appointed and sworn in at home to begin to draw his salary, and he has a certain length of time to reach his post of duty. He draws his salary during that time—or did formerly—and that was a much longer time than took him to get there. It is the time that took him to get there a hundred years ago, and he would get enough money in the way of salary in the interval to provide his expenses in getting there.

Mr. FLOOD. This is when he is transferred from one place to another.

Mr. LITTLE. That would apply in the same way, I suppose.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph. I wish to say to the gentleman that I do not wish to restrict the Consular Service in the freedom of transit of the respective officers, but I do not see why we should now inaugurate the policy of paying for the travel and transportation expenses of the families of these consular officers.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will withhold making the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I know the gentleman wants to be fair on this, and he would be the last man really to cripple an important service of this kind. I can assure the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I believe that this is the most vital thing in the entire bill. I want to call the gentleman's attention to another thing. The gentleman will notice that the law respecting the allowance of military officers contemplates that married men will take their families, and recognition of that is given and provision is made in the law for that.

Now, here it is extremely desirable that men be accompanied by their families to these posts, no matter whether they are consular or diplomatic. In the Army it is sometimes advisable indeed that they be not accompanied by their families, as when they go into field service, but in going from post to post they are allowed to be accompanied, and therefore provision is made in the law for the transportation of the Army officers and their effects and families.

Now, here is a service that much more urgently, in my judgment, requires that men should be accompanied by their families, for efficiency in the service, if for no other purpose, and why should we not enact the item as it is framed in this paragraph?

I believe the gentleman can rest assured that there will be no abuses under it. If he thinks there is any danger in it I would be perfectly willing to join in a request that the amounts be itemized.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is the policy always for the Government to place restrictions around the payment of allowances for the transportation of their officials. Here we are lifting all restrictions entirely and allowing the department to recognize any payment whatsoever that a diplomatic or consular officer may make. The gentleman knows that that may be subject to grave abuse.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is not what this paragraph permits. It says, "to pay the actual and necessary expenses, under such restrictions as the Secretary of State may prescribe." I am willing to write into the law that the agent, consular or diplomatic, must submit an itemized account, sworn to. That will cover it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will that meet the approval of the chairman of the committee? We are trying to legislate here.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Kansas and I are trying to legislate over here.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not the only legislator. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not compete with the distinguished gentleman, who rendered such distinguished service years and years ago in Armenia.

Mr. LITTLE. On that I will withdraw my remark. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. My objection to this paragraph is that there is no limitation on the department as to the expenditure. The policy of Congress is to restrict and limit expenditures. I recognize the need of the consuls visiting around. It is the criticism of the service that they are lodged and anchored too much in the place to which they are assigned. They merely think that their only duty is to do a little detailed office work and draw their salary. If there are some ambitious men among them who wish to go around and obtain useful information, I do not want to restrict them by arbitrary limitations.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I suggest that we insert this language. After the word "pay," in line 11, insert these words: "itemized and verified statements of the actual and necessary expenses of transportation."

Mr. FLOOD. I accept that amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. With that agreement, I will withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to line 11, page 7, after the word "pay," by inserting the words "the itemized and verified statements of."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Page 7, line 11, after the word "pay," insert "the itemized and verified statements of."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States and to meet the necessary expenses attendant upon the execution of the neutrality act, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, \$700,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation made for this object for the fiscal year 1919, which is hereby reappropriated and made available for this purpose: *Provided*, That in his discretion the President may employ part of this fund for payment for personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think some explanation should be made of this large appropriation that is carried in this bill, as to the method of its expenditure. If I mistake not, this is the item on which I received the assurance of the chairman of the committee that after the conclusion of the war the proviso, if I permitted it to be inserted last year, would not be continued in the future.

Mr. FLOOD. No. Here was the understanding that I had with the gentleman: That if he did not raise a point of order against it last year I would use my influence with the committee not to report it after the war had ended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, everybody knows that the reason for that proviso is ended with the armistice, and it would be an abuse of the understanding if it is continued.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I must be shown, then.

Mr. FLOOD. It would not be an abuse of the understanding, because the war has not ended. The understanding was that I would use my influence with the committee after the war was ended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course I am not inclined to underestimate the influence on the floor of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman asks as to the method of expenditure. The emergency fund is included under section 291 of the Revised Statutes, which provides:

Whenever any sum of money has been or shall be issued from the Treasury for the purposes of intercourse or treaty with foreign nations, in pursuance of any law, the President is authorized to cause the same to be duly settled annually with the proper accounting officers of the Treasury, by causing the same to be accounted for specifically, if the

expenditure may, in his judgment, be made public; and by making, or causing the Secretary of State to make, a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable to specify; and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended.

Now, the requirements of this statute are absolutely adhered to in the expenditure of this fund. Under this proviso this fund can be used for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia. Of course, we all know that technically the war has not ended. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] thinks it has ended, and I hope it has, but technically it has not. So far as the State Department is concerned, it is probable that its activities have been increased with the signing of the armistice and its burdens probably may be increased generally after peace is concluded. Of course, so far as this fund is concerned, the necessity for it will not be increased after peace is concluded, but it will be greatly lessened; but we will have a great many visitors coming to this country from the different allied countries during the next 12 months. The papers say the King of England will be here.

At any rate, a great many distinguished visitors will be here who will have to be entertained out of this fund. We still will have to employ a lot of gentlemen to get confidential information for the State Department in reference to conditions in the various countries that have been at war, especially some of those that are to be made into nations out of former existing nations. We have to send confidential agents to get that information, and there is no other fund from which to pay them except this. The State Department, as we all know, has a small secret service corps, which has rendered the most splendid service during the period of the war, and which the department thinks it necessary to keep up during this time. It has to be paid for out of this fund. There is no other fund out of which to pay it. All of these activities necessitate the employment in the department here in Washington of an additional number of employees—not a great many, but some—and since this proviso has been in the law the department has been paying them out of this fund. There is no other fund out of which to pay them, especially since the legislative bill cut down their appropriation for clerk hire from \$400,000 to \$125,000. I will say again to the gentleman that I do not lose sight of the understanding we had on the floor of the House last year when the gentleman so generously abstained from making a point of order to this proviso.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recognized then that, as we were at war, there was an absolute necessity to grant to the President a large sum of money to be used as he saw fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was necessary to have a fund for the employment of Secret Service men, or in any other way whereby he could obtain that information. These services might have to be employed here in the District of Columbia, and I was not going to raise a point of order against any activity that was necessary to protect the Government through its State Department in ferreting out spies and persons unfriendly to our cause.

Mr. FLOOD. They did splendid work.

Mr. STAFFORD. But now that emergency is past, and there is no justification why we should carry this provision in the Diplomatic bill, an appropriation virtually for clerical services in the Department of State. If the legislative bill has not carried an adequate appropriation the proper place to have that increased is in the other body at the other end of the Capitol, or to come before the Committee on Appropriations for an additional appropriation; but to have in this bill an appropriation that can be utilized for clerical services is not good legislation.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with the gentleman that it is not good legislation, but so far as the emergency is concerned that the gentleman is talking about, I will repeat—and I hope the gentleman will agree with me—that so far as the State Department is concerned the emergency is just as great as it ever has been. They will have to keep up their Secret Service. They have to entertain all of these people who come here. They have to have people located here in Washington to help do these things, and during the next 12 or 15 months this will go on.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but so far the gentleman has advanced no reason for an authorization to allow this fund to be used to pay for personal services here in the District of Columbia. If the President wants a fund for the entertainment of royalty when they visit this country, that is another question.

Mr. FLOOD. This is the fund out of which that comes.

Mr. STAFFORD. But that does not involve the idea of payment for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that on page 91 of the hearings Mr. Carr makes this statement touching this item:

Mr. CARR. It certainly is not any less important by reason of the fact that the war is supposed to be over, because the security of the future welfare of the United States depends on a great many things being done, a great many loose ends being tied up, a great deal of information being collected, and the failure to do that would be vastly more costly than this small sum of money.

Then in another place in the hearings he says this concerning this item:

I think the unexpended balance at the present time is approximately \$400,000.

Mr. ROGERS. With just about half of the year gone?

Mr. CARR. With just about half of the year gone and with a possibility of a great many expenditures in the second half of the year.

It is not possible to say what the balance may be. It is natural to suppose that we may need to know a good many things about some of the new countries. For example, it is possible that Austria will emerge from the peace conference very much subdivided into smaller nations and that Turkey may emerge from the peace conference in the same condition, and it is reasonable to suppose that the President and the Secretary of State may find it necessary to hurriedly send somebody to those countries to look into special subjects or to do special things. Those things frequently happen in international intercourse, and this would be the only fund for such expenses. There may be a good many things of that kind that may have to be done, and there is no other fund from which they could be done.

Mr. STAFFORD. What the gentleman has read confirms my position. He has not read language—at least, if he has I have not detected it—which shows the necessity for this fund to be used to pay personal services here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Carr said that there are many loose ends that need to be tied up, and so on, and they have people at work. They may work here in the District of Columbia or they may be over in Paris, or the President may need some of them when he comes back here.

Mr. STAFFORD. Every department official always wants to have a reserve fund which he may use in case the funds provided by the regular channel are not adequate. I would like to inquire of the chairman whether this is the fund from which the President is paying the retinue of college professors now with him at the peace council?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know anything about the retinue of college professors, but they are not paid out of this fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly direct us to what fund they are paid from?

Mr. FLOOD. The President has a pretty large fund of his own, and I expect they are paid out of that if they are paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that the \$700,000 available fund was used to pay the corps of professors from different colleges who have accompanied the President abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. No; not out of this. They do contemplate sending gentlemen to Austria and Hungary and Turkey and other places expected to be erected into States.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. This is a secret fund and has been so carried for years. Mr. Knox, when he was Secretary of State, carried it as a secret fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; until the last year the fund only amounted to \$200,000, but since our entry into the war they have asked for larger appropriations, and we have run it up to \$700,000, and now that the war is over they ask that it shall be continued. Last year I had the distinct promise from the chairman of the committee that if the proviso was allowed to remain when the war was at an end—and we differ whether it is at an end—this proviso should be eliminated. I am strongly opposed to the idea that we should vest in the Secretary of State in this bill authority for the employment of individuals here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman realizes that there will be a very few months before the war is actually over and when all this matter will be settled.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and that is why I am so persistent on my position.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. It might cost the Government a great deal more if it did not have this fund, and it could not do much harm if the provision is left in.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the point of order. If the gentleman wishes to have it inserted without the proviso, I am willing to make the point of order against the proviso with that understanding, or else I will make it against the whole paragraph.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Make it against the proviso. Mr. STAFFORD. With the understanding that the proviso is not to be offered again.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. It could not be offered again unless subject to a point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know what the gentleman means by not being "offered again."

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it agreeable to the gentleman to have the paragraph remain in the bill as it is without the proviso?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman understands that if the State Department should insist that the proviso be written in the bill the Committee on Foreign Affairs might offer it again.

Mr. FLOOD. It could not be offered again.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Suppose the Senate should insert it. I do not want gentlemen to misunderstand our position about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We had an understanding last year—although there is a difference as to the interpretation of it—that when the war was at an end the proviso should be eliminated. I am making the point of order to carry out that agreement as I understand it.

The Clerk read as follows:

To Mrs. Natalie Summers, widow of Madden Summers, late consul general to Moscow, \$5,500, one year's salary of her deceased husband, who died at his post of duty.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Certainly; I am very glad to accommodate the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman makes a point of order against the appropriation to Mrs. Summers?

Mr. STAFFORD. To reimburse Mrs. Summers.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee recommends one year's salary, amounting to \$5,500, to be paid to Mrs. Natalie Summers, widow of Madden Summers, late consul general to Moscow. This gentleman died there at his post of duty. He sacrificed his life in the cause of his country and these countries with which we were associated in the war. It has been the practice in this country—at least there are numerous precedents for it, and I say it has been the practice—that where a diplomatic and consular officer of the United States died at his post of duty in the discharge of his duty, to make an appropriation for his widow or heirs, and it has generally been one year's salary—just about what we do for the widows of Members of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand it is the uniform practice when a consular officer dies to pay a year's salary to his surviving widow or relatives?

Mr. FLOOD. I did not say it was the uniform practice, but I believe it is the practice, because there are so many precedents for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman refer me to any item having been reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House in the Diplomatic bill of that character in the last 10 years?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know about its being reported in the Diplomatic bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose there have been some instances where other consular officers have died at their posts of duty leaving surviving relatives.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, they are pretty good lives if no one has died at his post of duty within the last 10 years.

Mr. FLOOD. The only case that I am advised of just now, since I have been connected with the committee, was that of Mrs. Sorsby, whose husband did not actually die at his post of duty.

A claim was presented and a bill was introduced allowing Mrs. Sorsby one year's salary, and the difference between her situation and the situation in this case and the other cases was that her husband had been separated from the service for quite a number of years, but she undertook to prove that the

disability of which he died resulted from the unhealthy location at which he had exercised the duties of minister.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I submit a question to the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. One of my constituents, who was the consul at the city of Guadalajara, Mexico, recently died of pneumonia. I saw in the papers a few days ago that the Government, through the State Department, had directed that the remains be brought back home to be interred. I do not know what notice the gentleman would require before taking such a step, but if it is to be done in the case of Mrs. Summers, why should not this bill also carry an appropriation of one year's salary of the consulate at Guadalajara for Mrs. Silliman?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There are different facts.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, there are different facts, of course.

Mr. FLOOD. I think a bill making provision for Mrs. Silliman ought to be introduced, and the committee ought to consider it, and if it comes within the rules that the committee has acted on it ought to be reported.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Let me call the gentleman's attention to one or two facts of history—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to some cases that I happen to have investigated. The general deficiency act approved June 8, 1896, Statutes at Large, volume 29, page 268, carried an appropriation of \$8,750 for Mrs. Eliza Gray, widow of Isaac P. Gray, late United States minister to Mexico.

The general deficiency act approved July 28, 1892, Statutes at Large, volume 27, page 283, carried an appropriation for the widow of Alexander Clark, late the minister to Liberia, amounting to \$4,000, which was the amount of one year's salary.

In the deficiency act of March 3, 1893, an appropriation of \$5,375 was carried in behalf of Mrs. Sarah O. Hanna, widow of Bayless W. Hanna, late a minister to the Argentine Republic.

An act for the relief of Mrs. Lizzie Phelps, widow of Seth Ledyard Phelps, late minister of the United States to Peru, was approved on August 3, 1886, for one year's salary.

An act of July 8, 1898, for the relief of Verona E. Pollock, appropriated \$6,840, she being the widow of Alexander L. Pollock, late consul of the United States to San Salvador.

There are quite a number of such cases. I received a letter from the Secretary of State in reference to Mrs. Sorsby's case, which said that it has been the practice to make these appropriations, but drawing the distinction between Mrs. Sorsby's case and the cases in which the appropriations had been made, the difference being that Mr. Sorsby did not die while in the service. There is no doubt about the fact that Mr. Summers died at his post of duty while in the service of the United States. I do not recall that Congress has refused, when requested to do so, to make an appropriation for the relief of the widow of a representative, especially when that widow was greatly in need of financial assistance. The committee would not take the matter up and make an appropriation without a request in the shape of a bill being introduced to that effect, or a request before the committee, and in this case the facts were presented to the committee and were certainly most meritorious. This gentleman died at his post of duty, died from overwork for this country and for the allied countries, and died after having expended everything that he possessed, and he had actually expended his wife's fortune, or what was left of it from the Russian revolution. This widow is a Russian woman who married this American consul. She had a considerable estate of her own, but that now has been swept away by the Russian revolution.

The income from the estate had been used in maintaining this consul in his position. The post-allowance fund allowed him was expended, his salary was expended, everything he had was expended in maintaining his position as consul and in helping Americans who were stranded over there and who needed financial aid. On the whole, the committee thought that no more meritorious case could be presented for the consideration of Congress than this case. It stood on all fours, so far as the technical rights were concerned, with the cases which Congress had heretofore made appropriations in, and was probably more meritorious in fact than any of them. The committee recommended this appropriation, and I trust that the gentleman will not raise the point of order against it and that the Committee

of the Whole will vote this deserving lady this amount of money. As I said, she is absolutely without means now. She has come to America and has secured a position in the State Department and is working for her living. Whether her salary is sufficient to support herself and child I do not know; but, at any rate, this would certainly help her in the effort she is making to support herself and her child. If Congress would vote the amount of one year's salary, the interest from that could be used to supplement the small salary she is getting in the State Department.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the gentleman will not press the point of order against this item, because if there ever was an item of this kind that came before Congress which was meritorious this is it. When you realize that these people were there during the revolution and during the time that living was dangerous and everything was extremely high, you can readily see how that little fortune, or what they had, was consumed. I read from the testimony of Mrs. Summers:

You will perhaps better understand how expensive it was when I tell you that we had to pay \$7 for a pound of bread, and that bread was made of straw. Then when you bought sugar it cost \$15 a pound, and a pair of shoes cost you \$100. So it was impossible to save anything there. An egg cost \$1, and you can judge from those things how much it cost to live there.

This lady had a fortune of her own, and they used the income from that to help live upon, but when the Russian revolution took place, that fortune was swept away, and they no longer had any income from it. With these prices it is no wonder that they had absolutely nothing when Mr. Summers died. Mrs. Summers did not come to Congress and ask for the payment of money when doing nothing, but she came to America and asked for a position and procured a position in the State Department, earning \$150 a month, and with that money, and with that money solely, she has been able to eke out an existence for herself and her boy. There are plenty precedents for this appropriation. When we vote the widows of deceased Members of Congress a year's salary, we ought not to refuse this woman a year's salary after what she and her husband endured in Russia. He stood to his position until death severed his relations, and during a most trying time in the history of the world. Can we do less than make this small appropriation to the widow and orphan son of one of the Consular Service's most able men?

I do not think there is a man on the floor of this House who would want to go through with what this family did. I am sure that any man who had done so would have had his fortune eaten up by the expense. Now, it is a meritorious case, and every other country, probably every country in the world, pensions the widows of its deceased consuls. This country, said to be the richest and the best of them all, does not grant such pensions, and all this woman will ever get for the great service which her husband has performed in the 15 years of their married life, and she helped him perform his duty, will be the \$5,500 which we vote in this bill. There are plenty precedents for it; it is a meritorious case of the highest order and certainly one which Congress ought to recognize, and I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will not press his point of order against it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not make a point of order against this paragraph. There is but little I can say to supplement what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] have so well said in reference to this particular case, but I want to go on record, gentlemen, as saying that no man during this war more truly gave his life for his country than Madden Summers, consul general to Moscow. He served as consul for probably 20 years. His record in the State Department was of the best. He served in many different countries during that 20 years at a small salary, and, moving from place to place, it was impossible for him to accumulate any money. He married a lady who had a small fortune, but that fortune, as the gentleman from Virginia said, was wiped out by the Russian revolution.

He was sent to Moscow some time ago by this Government, having been specially chosen to represent our Government at that place during the important period of the war. He served there during dark and dangerous days of the revolution, giving his time and jeopardizing his life in behalf of his country. It was stated by the American ambassador and by other ambassadors from other countries at the time of his funeral in Moscow, as will be shown by the record, that he forfeited his life by overwork and his anxiety to serve his country and the people who had claims upon him as a representative of this country. He left not a dollar save a small sum which was invested in liberty bonds, the interest from which he turned

over to his old widowed mother, who lives in the State of Alabama. He left a widow and a young boy of 12 or 13 years of age. As soon as his wife could obtain transport to this country she came here and brought that boy, and they are now living in the city of Washington, it being her intention to bring him up as an American citizen. And I say, Mr. Chairman, that having sacrificed his life for his country it seems to me it is little enough for Congress to do to give her one year's salary in order to aid her in giving that boy an education, so that he may be better fitted to become a useful American citizen.

As the gentleman from Virginia said, there are numerous precedents in the Diplomatic Service for this sort of action. The gentleman from Virginia has called attention to these precedents. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to the fact that his own committee, the Committee on Appropriations, only a year or two ago brought in a bill which gave the widow of a United States Supreme Court judge \$14,000, a year's salary, and a little prior to that another appropriation of the same amount was made for the family of another United States Supreme Court judge, and before that for the family of Mr. Justice Brewer, of the United States Supreme Court. No point of order was raised against those. There are many precedents that could be cited for this, and I wish to say that since I have been in Congress, knowing the facts as I do, knowing the necessities of that good woman and her fatherless boy, I know of no case which is more worthy than this one which is now presented to the House.

I knew Madden Summers from childhood. A truer, finer, more loyal man never lived. He was exceedingly capable, and if he had devoted his talents and energy to private affairs rather than in the service of his country he would not have died a poor man. No man had a higher conception of duty. It was that sense of duty which caused him to remain at his post in Moscow when others were leaving, and in spite of threats against him, and to at last suddenly fall a victim to overwork and worry on account of the many official duties which were pressing upon him. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not insist upon his point of order, but will permit the House to vote upon the proposition to make this slight recompense to Mrs. Summers and her bright, fatherless boy. Madden Summers, if he is permitted to know, will appreciate it more than he would the most costly monument that could be erected to his memory.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I only want to occupy the floor for a minute or two to say that the suggestion I made in reference to the widow of John R. Silliman is justified in every argument that has been made in behalf of Mrs. Summers. Mr. Silliman was not only consul during the revolution in Mexico but during a revolution that has continued so long that it makes the Russian revolution look like a brief May-day picnic. Mr. Silliman, because of his conscientious, courageous adherence to his duty and his efforts to protect the rights of citizens of the United States, was arrested and put into a vile prison and sentenced to be shot. Of course, the authorities then controlling Mexico thought better of it and did not shoot him. Mr. Silliman acted practically as our ambassador in Mexico for a long time. He was the only reliable agent that the Government had to look after diplomatic affairs, although he did not have diplomatic rank. Subsequently, when things quieted down a little in Mexico he was made consul or consul general at Guadalajara, and there died at his post a few days ago. If this item is justified the other certainly is, and I agree with the gentleman in saying that I believe this is a proper appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened attentively to all that has been said in defense as a warrant for this private claim being carried in this appropriation bill. I have scanned the testimony that was given before the committee and have since reviewed it. I do find cases dating from 1896 back where the Congress did vote a year's salary to widows of diplomatic officers. I only find one instance where an appropriation has been voted for the widow of a consular officer. Now, there is a statute which has been referred to in the previous paragraph providing for the payment to widows and heirs at law of diplomatic and consular officers of an allowance equal to the amount of the salaries during the period of the transportation of the remains back to their residence in the United States. That amount of money has been paid to this widow. The widow is now employed at the department. I assume she is giving full value to the Government in the service she is rendering; but, Mr. Chairman, here we have an instance cited by the gentleman from Texas, and there are many instances, where similar action will have to be taken if we recognize this claim. I question whether it is good policy to establish a precedent, the first I have been able to find since 1896, nearly 25 years, and therefore

I make the point of order that it is legislation not authorized on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the commission to continue its work under the treaties of 1884, 1889, 1905, and 1906 between the United States and Mexico, \$62,700.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think this item, of course, should be continued in the bill. I am not going to advocate any particular amount that should be contained in the paragraph, although I have some views of my own on the subject. But I do want to call the attention of the committee to the elements that are included in the amount that the bill carries. This international commission that is supposed to be fixing the boundary line between Mexico and the United States has had a most precarious existence. No matter which party seems to be in power, there is always an international boundary commission, and the boundary line seems to be about as unsettled and undetermined now as it was in the beginning. The Rio Grande River moves a little now and then one way or another, and I presume it is advisable to determine whether the boundary line has shifted a few feet this way or that way from year to year. In many instances where the Rio Grande has made considerable of a change in its location the matter is still undetermined whether the territory that has thus been cut off belongs to Mexico or the United States. I believe they have now a tentative program whereby they propose to swap horses—a little land we lost for a little land they lost. That is, we propose to do so. Whether we can accomplish it or not I do not know. Some of the most fantastic things imaginable are pervading the atmosphere of this boundary at this time.

Part of the city of El Paso is in dispute. I do not state this as an indication that there is no work to do, but as an indication that no work has been done, going back through the years until the memory of man runneth almost not to the contrary. This has been a sinecure position. It is now. Treaties have been made which, I suppose, require to be kept going. It is now proposed by the gentleman in charge—and I wish to state here that the committee listened to him, I think, with a great deal of interest, and he really impressed me as being a man who really wanted to do something, and it was quite refreshing and quite unique in the history of international boundary commissions between this country and Mexico, but whether the views he presents will accomplish something or not is a different question—it is proposed by the gentleman to use a large part of this money for the purpose of determining the possibility of irrigation on each side of the boundary line, and particularly in the United States along the rivers that flow into the Rio Grande. Manifestly that has nothing on the face of this earth to do with the purpose for which the commission was created. It has nothing to do with the fixing of the boundary, except in a most remote sense.

Now, I join with the Members of the House generally in favoring strongly the irrigation of arid lands wherever they may be found, and I am in favor of irrigating any land within the United States that is capable of being irrigated and open it up to settlement. But we have a service in the United States whose specific business it is to do that very thing, and that is the Reclamation Service. Now, the Reclamation Service has engineers, it has experts, and that sort of men; and it is proposed now that this international boundary commission shall employ additional engineers and experts. Manifestly, to me it appears to be a duplication of work. I do not think the amount carried in this bill can be wisely expended, but I am not going to make any motion to cut it down. I am going to content myself with stating the facts briefly to the committee and express the fond hope that I trust some day we will make a treaty with Mexico that will end this infernal nuisance of a continuing commission that does nothing. Now, I imagine some people will say that some commissioners have done something. Yes. From the reports they have made they have gauged water in the streams and listened to the twittering of the swallows and observed the movement of the sunbeams down there, and all to no practical purpose. I do think this sort of a thing ought to be ended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman does the gentleman who now occupies the position of commissioner, and those who preceded him, justice. This commission was organized under a treaty between this country and Mexico. The last modification of it was made during the last Roosevelt administration. This treaty obligates this country to appoint

a commissioner and an engineer and a clerk to meet similar appointees from Mexico to fix, from time to time, the boundary line between this country and the Republic of Mexico. As we all know, the Rio Grande is a shifting stream. Its bed is here to-day, while some time in the future it will be 50 yards or 100 yards or maybe a mile away, running all around the territory that belongs to the United States and putting it on the Mexican side of the river, or vice versa. And this treaty is made to establish a place to which these pieces of land that are cut off by the change in the stream of the river, called *bancos*, belong. It was realized when the treaty was made that the commission would remain in existence for a long time and, indeed, as long as the Rio Grande continued to change its course and until some system could be devised by which the Rio Grande could be kept in its bed. For a long time the American commissioner was Gen. Mills, a retired Army officer, who received no salary. The other officials of the commission did receive salaries. Questions of large moment have arisen by reason of the shifting of the Rio Grande River. They involve possibility of war and involve the citizenship of a great many—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman point to any specific, affirmative conclusion at which the commission has arrived in fixing the boundary at any one spot in the last 10 years?

Mr. FLOOD. At Nogales, a town that has grown up on the American-Mexican boundary, nobody knew where the boundary line was. This very gentleman who is commissioner now, and his Mexican associate, went there and fixed the boundary line of that town.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it not true that that is still in process of adjustment?

Mr. FLOOD. It is not. It is absolutely and definitely settled. As to the *bancos*, the question arises whether these *bancos* have been settled. It has been agreed upon and put in a subsequent treaty that where there were less than 600 acres of land in a *banco* it should be considered as belonging to the country on the side of the river on which that *banco* was.

There are a great many questions of large moment that have been settled. There is a question in El Paso, involving 600 or 700 acres of land, thickly built up, constituting the southern end of El Paso, known as the Chamizal tract, about which Gen. Mills and his Mexican associate had many conferences, reaching different conclusions, and finally brought down a Canadian, and he did not agree entirely with either one of them. That is unsettled, it is true, but the Mexicans as well as Americans have come to realize that that is American territory, and the people who live on it will have no fear of its being thrown into Mexico.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will permit an inquiry, I want to say that we have had a controversy for a century or more with Great Britain as to the boundary line between the United States and Canada. At last a boundary commission was appointed to locate the line. That commission has been working for a very few years, and they have the work all done with the exception of the map-making. Some of them are up in Alaska now. Field work there may require another year, and office work for two or three years may be needed, but it is a fine, complete job.

Mr. GARNER. Is that the Tawney Commission?

Mr. FLOOD. No; that is the Barnard Commission. That has done good work.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is a job that was well done. Is this boundary between the United States and Mexico always going to be an elusive and undetermined thing?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me to interrupt, I will say that just as long as the Rio Grande rises and at different times changes its course, you have got to have somebody to adjust these differences existing there.

Let me say to the gentleman from Minnesota that when I first came to Congress I went on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I was under the same impression that he is now under, that this was money wasted. I went on there with the determination to have this item cut out, assuming that I knew all about it, and I thought I was going to do a very statesmanlike and economical thing, and I thought I would put this off. I was green and inexperienced then, but when I heard the facts of the case, when three Secretaries of State made statements before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the effect that these questions arising from the boundary of this stream between these two countries could be handled more economically in this way than through the State Department, I was disarmed.

I make this statement now: Three different Secretaries of State—Mr. Root, Mr. Knox, and Mr. Bryan—each stated that from the economical viewpoint it was more desirable to have

this boundary commission than to do the work through the State Department.

Mr. FLOOD. I will go further than the gentleman from Texas, and say that of course as long as the Rio Grande continues to shift its course, some such arrangement as this will have to be kept in existence to determine where the true boundary line is. But the gentleman who is now the American commissioner came before us and submitted a proposition which may lead to results that will not necessitate this commission longer, if his plans are successful, because he proposes to keep the Rio Grande in its present bed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. And that is what this additional appropriation is for. He proposes to have a survey made of the rivers that are tributary to the Rio Grande in America and in Mexico. The gentleman from Minnesota wants some other service to do it. The service that he has in mind, the Irrigation and Reclamation Service, has no right to do it. These commissioners, representing America and Mexico, under the authority of this treaty, can go into Mexico and make their survey. They can make a survey of the rivers that are tributary to the Rio Grande in these two countries, and make a report to these two Governments, and then, if the Governments initiate a treaty by which proper appropriation can be made to build dams to control the flood waters of the tributaries of the Rio Grande River, the Rio Grande will flow down its present course and constitute a permanent boundary between the two countries, and there will be no necessity for a future commission to determine from time to time the boundary line. It seems to me that is a most sensible thing to do. When the tributary waters of the Rio Grande are controlled there will be no reason for fixing a new boundary. That is what the appropriation is for.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I do not for a moment share the gentleman's optimism, that the carrying out of the present program outlined by the commissioner will produce the results expected. In other words, I do not believe that the regulation of the tributaries and the regulation of their flow for irrigation purposes will result in the Rio Grande maintaining a permanent course. There are going to be practically the same operations of nature. The Rio Grande will keep on shifting.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman's view does not accord with that of the Mexican engineer and the American engineer on the subject.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Well, I remember what James J. Hill said, a living truth that no one then believed, and it is true now, that "There is only one way to keep the Mississippi River from changing its course, and that is to lath and plaster the bottom of it from one end to the other."

Mr. FLOOD. This is not as big a river as the Mississippi.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. No; but it is more apt to change its course. The Rio Grande is in a more level country and more subject to floods, and it moves back and forth.

What I want to inquire particularly about is this: Does not the gentleman think it would be a wiser thing for us to propose a treaty with Mexico to fix some kind of a boundary line that would be stable, so that a man on the line could know whether he was on the American side or on the Mexican side?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not see how we could give away American territory or take Mexican territory. Certainly I see no constitutional way by which we can cede American territory to another country.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. We could certainly take a spot and say, "That is the boundary line," and keep it there, just as we have done with respect to the Canadian boundary line.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is it not a fact that each country must get water from the river, and in order that they may do that the boundary line must go along the river? If the river goes over the boundary, the people of the other country do not get the water they need for irrigation purposes. That is a very essential matter, it seems to me. That is where the great fight will come.

Mr. FLOOD. I think it is essential to give the river a permanent bed before we can make a treaty defining where the boundary line of the river is. This proposition is in the right direction. Part of this appropriation also goes to pay gaugers, to show how much water we are entitled to and how much Mexico is entitled to. That work certainly ought to be done, because if we use water that belongs to Mexico it creates a liability—it might be a large liability—on the part of our Gov-

ernment. We have already had to settle one large claim of this kind.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Each country is entitled to half, is it not?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. So I think the appropriation is not at all extravagant. The commissioner, Judge Hill, of Tennessee, was before the committee, and showed exactly what he wanted to do with the whole amount. I hope the committee will adopt the item just as it is.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I should like to invite the attention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] to the fact that the \$35,000, to which he referred, has been increased to \$62,700, which indicates that this seems to be a growing project.

Mr. FLOOD. No; it is not growing.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Developing?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Getting to be a bigger river?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at all. The appropriation in 1912, the last year of the Taft administration, was \$50,000. Since then we have cut it down, and this is only a small amount more than what it was the last year of that administration.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have here an increase of appropriation of \$766,000 from that carried in the present appropriation act.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think that the chairman should give some information to the House as to the reason for this unusual increase in the appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. The principal increase in appropriations in this bill, Mr. Chairman, is in the Consular Service. The committee tried to carry into effect the plans adopted by the State Department for the improvement and development of our Consular Service and in that effort we have made this increased appropriation here, and in other items with reference to the Consular Service we have recommended similar increases.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand it, if the gentleman will permit, the salaries of consuls general, vice consuls, and consuls are established by law.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the department can not increase those salaries except by a change of the substantive law?

Mr. FLOOD. The department can not increase those classes, but they can appoint consuls to higher classes than they have now. But what I was going to say was that the department proposes—and we are in sympathy with that purpose—to add to the Consular Service 150 vice consuls at salaries ranging from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Then the department proposes to have 25 consular assistants and to increase the regular consular force by 25, and to abolish the consular agents who draw fees. There are 127 of them. There is an apparent increase of 200 in the Consular Service and a real increase of some 75, because the consular inspectors are increased from 5 to 7. Then the purpose was to appoint more consuls to the higher grades up to that of consul general, and to have no consuls under \$3,500. They can accomplish that by appointing consuls only to the sixth grade. The vice consuls will get up to \$3,000, and the consuls will begin at \$3,500 and go up to the salaries allowed consuls general.

That plan, as worked out, will give 200 addition in the paid service, and to increase these salaries will necessitate an increase in this bill of \$766,000, which the committee has recommended.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice that the committee in this instance gave the department its full estimate.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is there any instance in the bill where the committee declined to give the department the full estimate?

Mr. FLOOD. The committee was disposed to cut the department estimates in several instances, but we were always confronted with the proposition that where we have done that the Committee on Appropriations, of which the gentleman is a distinguished member, had come along with a deficiency appropriation bill and given them what they had asked for.

Mr. STAFFORD. So that was the warrant for the gentleman's action in closing his eyes and granting them, in accordance with the estimate made and in one particular case \$100,000 more than the estimates, when there was no request for it?

Mr. FLOOD. I did not say that.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no request from the department for that.

Mr. FLOOD. I have given you a reason, and a good reason, and it was not the reason the gentleman quoted on the floor. I say we were confronted with the fact when we wanted to keep the estimates down the gentleman's committee had gone on and given them what they asked for.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman ought not to indulge in hyperbole of statement.

Mr. FLOOD. It is not hyperbole of statement.

Mr. STAFFORD. The record shows that you did increase this item.

Mr. FLOOD. I cite the record, which shows that the Committee on Appropriations has increased appropriations to the full estimates of the department and gave large amounts in addition to what the Foreign Affairs Committee had given for the same purpose. I said that as to the items we proposed to cut down we found that when there had been a reduction the department went to the Committee on Appropriations and got from that committee the amount they asked from us.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, in some few instances.

Mr. FLOOD. In the instances we wanted to cut down.

Mr. STAFFORD. Not in every instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out "\$62,700" and insert "\$37,500."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 10, line 8, strike out "\$62,700" and insert "\$37,500."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this item provoked some discussion a year ago, and it was called to the attention of the House that the item was then sought to be increased from \$25,500 to \$37,500, the amount then carried in the bill. If my memory serves me right, though the item remained as recommended by the committee, the Senate reduced the amount to \$25,500, but the conferees restored it to the original amount.

Now, what do we find here? We have a useless commission, which was in innocuous desuetude for several years. It was so useless that the Democratic administration under Mr. Bryan failed to appoint a commissioner for several years, and there was so little usefulness that a former Member of this House, Mr. John Wesley Gaines, predecessor of the Representative from Tennessee, Mr. JOSEPH BYRNS, said that there was hardly any work whatsoever to do, and he resigned because he got ashamed of taking the money from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. Where did the gentleman get that idea?

Mr. STAFFORD. I happened to have the pleasure of the company of Mr. John Wesley Gaines when we stopped at the same hotel.

Mr. FLOOD. He told the committee that he almost worked himself to death on it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I know Mr. Gaines had the reputation of being a most erudite Member, searching out information on more subjects than we had ever known before, but on this commission he found no work to perform.

What do we find here as a justification for this commission to determine the elusive and ever-changing boundary line of the Rio Grande between the United States and Mexico? Why, they want to constitute themselves into a commission to establish reclamation projects along the Rio Grande.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not want to be diverted from this line of thought, but I will later on be very glad to yield.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Go on.

Mr. STAFFORD. We find that this additional appropriation is for that purpose, to determine surveys of the river. We find Commissioner Hill, when explaining the reason for this additional appropriation, using this language:

I was speaking about this additional appropriation; \$10,000 of that appropriation is for the purpose of establishing some eight or nine gauging stations on the river, so as to take the water measurements at different points, in order to find out where the water comes from that forms the Rio Grande River, and find out what part comes from tributaries in the United States.

If we are going to launch into the project of converting a boundary commission into a commission to erect large reservoir dams, so as to keep this ever elusive and evasive stream within bounds, why, this appropriation will mount and mount until it reaches the millions. Now, I am speaking seriously. We have a Reclamation Service and we have a Geological Survey. The Geological Survey has a large appropriation to determine the flow of the streams throughout the country. We have a Reclamation Service that can be called upon by this commission; but this commission, like other commissions that have no real work, want to magnify their importance and want to engage in some work that is not in keeping with the original purpose of the law.

I am not surprised that the committee recommends everything that is asked for by the department. So far as we have

covered the appropriations recommended by this committee, there is no evidence of a disposition on their part to curtail expenditures—none whatsoever. Here we are virtually doubling the appropriation to embark on the extravagant policy of seeing whether it is feasible to erect impounding dams on the Rio Grande. They are going to employ expert men whose services can be obtained from other activities of the Government. I think there should be some check on the activity of these useless commissions. Mr. Hill may be very sincere and conscientious in his work, nevertheless the committee owes it to the House in these times to try and keep these activities within reasonable bounds. If, as I remember, this commission did not have a commissioner for three years, why can we not now keep the appropriation down to the amount carried in last year's appropriation bill, which was \$12,000 more than was carried in the previous bill, \$12,000 more than they expended in the prior year? Why can we not adhere to that amount, rather than go into this extravagant policy of almost doubling the appropriation and rambling off into these outside agencies, which have no real merit at the present time? Are we going to use this investigation as a warrant for expending millions and millions of dollars upon irrigation projects on the Rio Grande? I do not think anybody is in sympathy with such an idea in these present times, when the money of the country is needed for so many pressing undertakings.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, it happens that I have some familiarity with the section of the country out yonder "Where the Rio Grande ripples when there's water in its bed," and I know a little about the problems confronting these gentlemen on the commission. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] calls the commission useless, and says that the work done by them is without value. I can not agree with him. In the first place, we are commanded by a treaty to do it, and we have to maintain a commission to determine the boundary line between Mexico and the United States. That boundary has been defined along the line that divides northern Mexico from New Mexico, Arizona, and California, but the real difficulty is in determining the boundary from the city of El Paso down to the mouth of the river below Brownsville. Along that border we are confronted with a condition that neither the wisdom of Congress nor the skill of the engineers can cope with successfully. We define the boundary to-day, and to-morrow there will be a flood in the river from the melting of the snows of Colorado, and a large amount of water will come from the streams on both sides that flow in and the boundary is shifted by nature. We can not help that.

During the period when the revolution made it impossible to continue the work intelligently appropriations were lessened, and lessened, I suppose, to as small an amount as we could make in view of the fact that we are bound by treaty to help support the commission. Now comparative quiet has at last come to Mexico, and she has announced herself ready to take up the work.

Mr. FLOOD. They have been at work for a year.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I know, but they are ready now to go to work more assiduously. We can not refuse to keep the commission alive; we are bound by the treaty.

With reference to what is claimed as reclamation projects, I do not understand it to be that at all. In the State of Texas there are two or three considerable streams that are tributary to the Rio Grande, the Pecos River and the Devils River being the principal ones. On the other side are the Conchos, the Sabinas, the San Juan, and other rivers contributing to the Rio Grande. Of course, Mexico could build dams there and could, if she pleased, permanently lessen the supply in the Rio Grande by absorbing all the waters contributed by the Conchos, which are the largest tributary streams. She could shut off the water of the Sabinas and other streams, and so ultimately, if inclined to do it, she could permanently injure the people of this country by lessening the amount of water available for irrigation. Under the treaty, each is entitled to one-half of the flow of the river.

I dare say that the purpose in the mind of the commissioner is that dams should be erected on the Pecos and the Devils Rivers and other streams worthy of putting dams across. The Mexicans would put them on their rivers, and by withholding from the flow into the Rio Grande a large part of the water contributed by those streams it would have the tendency to make more permanent the boundaries that may have been defined.

Mr. FLOOD. The flood waters which cause the stream to change its bed would be impounded.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That was the statement which was made, but I do not think it is entirely true, because the flood frequently comes from the melting of the snows in Colorado.

Mr. FLOOD. The streams that come from the mountains will be impounded.

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; there are no mountains on the Pecos and on the Devils River to amount to anything. They are the biggest streams on our side. There are mountains back in Mexico, near the Conchos. This boundary work also serves a useful purpose in helping to preserve the peace.

Mr. STAFFORD. My amendment carries the same amount that was carried in the current year, but what I want to prevent is these irrigation projects.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman could specifically forbid anything being done in that way.

Mr. STAFFORD. I limit it by putting in the amount carried in the present bill.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, if adopted, will so reduce the appropriation as to make it impossible for the commission to carry on the proposed work with reference to investigating the stages of the river at various seasons of the year and the source of water supply which flows through the river. The purpose of these investigations is intended to secure information expressly with reference to irrigation. In the southern Rio Grande Valley in Texas is a very large area that in the last few years has begun to be irrigated. This section of the country is developing very rapidly, and the interest in irrigation is increasing. As this work goes on and more and more water is diverted from the Rio Grande, necessarily the United States will become involved in controversy with the Republic of Mexico and the citizens of Mexico with respect to the amount of water diverted from the river on the American side and the Mexican side.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Let me say that so much water was taken out in southern Texas that the Mexicans protested that we were getting more than our share.

Mr. FLOOD. Let me call attention to the fact that when the dam above El Paso was built we had to agree to furnish Mexico enough water to irrigate 60,000 acres of land.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. If the committee will bear with me a moment, I desire to say that if we await the time when Mexican subjects and the Republic of Mexico make claims against the United States with reference to the diversion of these waters, and if we are not in possession of any facts whatever, the Government of the United States will be in a very embarrassing position with reference to these claims. If, however, the boundary commission, which is international in character, and which is empowered to make these investigations not only on the American side but upon the Mexican side, is permitted to go ahead with this work, it will have on hand information and data with which to meet these claims, and upon which an equitable and fair adjustment of the relative rights of the two countries can be based.

I want to say in this same connection that this information will not only be desirable from the standpoint of irrigation, but incidentally it will be valuable along the lines of the strictly boundary proposition, because, unless the boundary is definitely fixed from time to time in accordance with the changes of the river, citizens of Mexico will present claims against the United States Government at inflated valuations, and unless we have accurate and concise data at hand the Government will be placed in an embarrassing position in meeting these claims. I hope the committee will retain the item in the present form, because to reduce it, as the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes, would seriously handicap the commission in carrying on this proposed work, and so far as irrigation is concerned would absolutely render it impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOUNDARY LINE, ALASKA AND CANADA, AND THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

To enable the Secretary of State to mark the boundary and make the surveys incidental thereto between the Territory of Alaska and the Dominion of Canada, in conformity with the award of the Alaskan Boundary Tribunal and existing treaties, including employment at the seat of government of such surveyors, computers, draftsmen, and clerks as are necessary; and for the more effective demarcation and mapping, pursuant to the treaty of April 11, 1908, between the United States and Great Britain, of the land and water boundary line between the United States and the Dominion of Canada, as established under existing treaties, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, including the salaries of the commissioner and the necessary engineers, surveyors, draftsmen, computers, and clerks in the field and at the seat of government, rental of offices at Washington, D. C., expense of printing and necessary traveling, for payment for timber necessarily cut in determining the boundary line not to exceed \$500, and commutation to members of the field force while on field duty or actual expenses not exceeding \$5 per day each, to be expended in accordance with regulations from time to time prescribed by the Secretary of State, \$40,000, together with the unexpended balances of previous appropriations for these objects: *Provided*, That hereafter advances of money under the

appropriation "Boundary line, Alaska and Canada, and the United States and Canada," may be made to the commissioner on the part of the United States and by his authority to chiefs of parties, who shall give bond under such rules and regulations and in such sum as the Secretary of State may direct, and accounts arising under advances shall be rendered through and by the commissioner on the part of the United States to the Treasury Department as under advances heretofore made to chiefs of parties: *Provided*, That when the commissioner is absent from Washington on official business he shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses of subsistence, not in excess of \$8 per day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I wish to inquire the reason why the committee increased the amount of actual expenses that may be paid to the members of the field force from \$3.50, as carried in existing law, to \$5. I presume that is because of the higher cost of living.

Mr. FLOOD. Exactly. Dr. Barnard, the commissioner, did not appear before the committee, but he made a statement to me—he may have written me a letter—and I made it to the committee, to the effect that expenses along this boundary line were very high, and that the field force could not get along and pay their expenses on \$3.50 a day. The increased cost of living along the boundary line was very considerable. It is expensive to maintain themselves there at any time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this a flat per diem voted to them regardless of the amount they spend for actual expenses?

Mr. FLOOD. No; the commissioner requires an itemized statement, and he can not allow them exceeding \$5 a day.

Mr. STAFFORD. What per diem do they receive?

Mr. FLOOD. They receive a monthly salary. The commissioner himself gets \$5,000 a year, the engineer to the commissioner gets \$3,300 a year, the chief clerk and disbursing officer \$1,700 a year, and he stays here. The surveyor gets \$2,200 a year, and then they have another surveyor at \$2,160, some topographers, who I suppose stay here most of the time, and then they have a lot of young axmen and rodmen and employees of that kind. They are paid \$75 and \$80 and \$100 a month when actually engaged on the line.

Mr. STAFFORD. In what part of the Alaskan boundary is the field force at present engaged?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, they have finished that entirely.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then what is the need of providing this \$5?

Mr. FLOOD. The field work of the location of the 4,150 miles of boundary, the location of which was intrusted to these commissioners, namely, from the Arctic Ocean to Mount St. Elias and thence to Cape Muzon, and from the Pacific to the Atlantic Ocean, excepting through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, is practically completed, there remaining to be done during the coming season only the erection of some range marks in Passamaquoddy Bay, the setting of some monuments for a short distance on the St. Croix River, the examination of part of the located boundary line east of the summit of the Rocky Mountains by the United States parties, and the survey of 16 miles of boundary line along the Maine Highlands by Canadian parties. The work has been done jointly under the direction of one United States and one British commissioner by the United States and the Canadian survey parties, and one-half of the expense has been borne by each Government. The field work will be completed during the coming season, but as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] said, it will take several years after that to complete the office work and make up their report.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I believe this is a pretty large amount to be granted to members of the field force in the territory that the gentleman has just referred to. Everyone realizes that the cost of living in Alaska is out of all comparison to the cost in the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am directing attention to the commutation and per diem allowance for the field force.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin will appreciate that these men have to go into the interior, into inaccessible places, where communication is not easy, where lines of transportation even do not exist. Subsistence has to be carted in, sometimes by horse, sometimes by men on their backs, sometimes by canoe. It is exceedingly expensive. These field parties locating the boundary are obliged under the necessities of the case to operate in areas usually remote from where lines of communication exist. It is just like fitting out an expedition to penetrate into inaccessible places. It is mighty expensive. The amount heretofore allowed was \$3.50 per day, and I am sure the gentleman will appreciate the fact that if we increase it by \$1.50 a day, that

is not an unusual increase, having in mind the increase in all things of that character.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, we have a standard for such allowances and we are voting \$4 a day on account of field activities, and why should we vote \$5 a day to this fund?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman will quite appreciate that \$4 a day may be all right for a person living in a civilized region, but—

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the amount voted for the field force in the forest reserves out in the Rockies and mountainous districts.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This is much different from that in every way, because they have established places from which supplies can be secured in the forest reserves, and they have roads, and so forth, but these men have to go into the wilderness—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Hundreds of miles away, perhaps.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. For instance, in operating between Minnesota and Canada, although the distance from the end of the railroad was not perhaps more than 75 miles, they had to go by canoe and overland, and it was a trip which took a long time, even from a distance, as the gentleman from Texas has observed, of about 50 or 75 or 100 miles.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the expense of transportation borne by the Government and not by the individual members of the field party?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is true, but I am advised by the commissioner, and as I said before I wish we could always get as efficient a man as this commissioner to do the Government's business, for he just delivers us dollars for every cent we give him—he informs me he simply can not keep up the subsistence within the amount allowed.

Mr. STAFFORD. When does the gentleman believe the field force of this commission will be ended?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This year; this will be the last bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under those circumstances, Mr. Chairman, with the assurance given by the gentleman, who is well versed in the work of this commission, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU AT BRUSSELS FOR REPRESSION OF THE AFRICAN SLAVE TRADE.

To meet the share of the United States in the expenses of the special bureau created by article 82 of the general act concluded at Brussels, July 2, 1890, for the repression of the African slave trade and the restriction of the importation into and sale in a certain defined zone of the African Continent of firearms, ammunition, and spirituous liquors, for the year 1920, \$125.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I rise for information. We are all interested in the effort of the administration to establish democracy the world over. We see here an item for the repression of the African slave trade. I think the committee would be interested in information as to the extent that there is some activity on the part of our Government in conjunction with any other in the suppression of the African slave trade referred to in this item.

Mr. FLOOD. Our Government is a party to a treaty for that purpose, signed at Brussels, July 2, 1890, and proclaimed about two years later. Now, this treaty—

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this some reference to the slave trade for which King Leopold of Belgium was criticized so severely a few years back and which appeared in the public press?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know about that. There has been a species of slave trade going on in Africa, and a number of nations, through their accredited representatives, met at Brussels in 1890, later in 1899, and again in 1906 and entered into an agreement to suppress that slave trade, and also agreed to provide a certain amount of money for this purpose. I understand that it has almost been entirely suppressed, but the treaty is still in effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the officer is still being paid out of this money, and it is a continual appropriation, because an officer never gives up, even after the work is ended.

Mr. FLOOD. If he is being paid, he is being paid very little by this country, and if he can live on that he is a very economical official.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, after receiving the information from the gentleman from Virginia, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pan American Union, \$100,000: *Provided*, That any moneys received from the other American Republics for the support of the union shall be paid into the Treasury as a credit, in addition to the appropriation, and may be drawn therefrom upon requisitions of the chairman

of the governing board of the union for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the union and of carrying out the orders of said governing board: And provided further, That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized to print an edition of the monthly bulletin not to exceed 6,000 copies per month, for distribution by the union during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This appropriation of \$100,000 is increased \$15,000 over that carried by the present act. Will the gentleman inform the committee—because we are all more or less interested in the activities of the Pan American Union—as to the cost of maintenance of that association, the amount that our Government contributes, and the amount the other associated Governments contribute for maintenance of that work?

Mr. FLOOD. I think the other governments contribute about \$60,000 and we contribute, up to this time, \$85,000. That constitutes the appropriations for the maintenance of the buildings and the force that they have.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why is it increased?

Mr. FLOOD. These officials in the bureau, and there are quite a number of them, have got no increase in salaries in recent years—for a great many years—and the governing board felt, owing to the increase in the cost of living in Washington, that they were entitled to an increase. They do not participate in this \$120 or \$240 which Congress appropriates, as they are not officials of the United States Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the salary expense of those connected with this bureau here in the city?

Mr. FLOOD. It is something over \$100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. How is it proposed to increase the salary of the respective officials, which entails an additional burden upon the United States of \$15,000?

Mr. FLOOD. It is proposed to get about \$12,500 from the other Governments, making something like \$27,500, and that will be apportioned among the employees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman any information as to what salaries the officials are receiving under this new schedule of estimates?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Barrett appeared before the committee—

Mr. STAFFORD. What salary does the director receive today?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Barrett—I think his salary is \$10,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is proposed to increase it to what amount?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think it is proposed to increase his salary at all.

It is supposed to increase the salary of the clerks of different grades. They have some interpreters and clerks and people of that kind in the bureau. Mr. Barrett filed a very lengthy statement, which was printed as a part of the hearings. I do not think he gave a detailed statement there of the salaries as they are now or as they would be, but he did state that during all this period of the increase in the cost of living the salaries of the clerks and laborers and officers of that bureau have not been increased, and the governing board thought they ought to be increased, and this suggestion was taken up. And if we get the appropriation, the ministers or ambassadors from the South American countries will take it up and get their countries to contribute their proportionate share of the increase.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a pretty liberal increase that is going to be provided if we are not going to increase the salary of the director to any amount.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand that his salary is not going to be increased. The property has been maintained out of this appropriation, and the cost of maintaining that splendid building down there has also increased.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FOR PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION.

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of International Arbitration at Brussels, Belgium, \$2,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the chairman of the committee inform me, if possible, if there are any delegates to this International Interparliamentary Union? Has this body ever sent official delegates? And what is the purpose of it at this time?

Mr. FLOOD. The Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLOOD. Every Member of Congress who desires it is a member of it, and every Member of Congress can attend any of its meetings, as can every member of any parliamentary body.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, they can become members without the payment of dues, and there are about 185 Members of this House who are members.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I see. As I understand the French Parliament and the English Parliament—I may be wrong—have selected from their bodies certain men—

Mr. FLOOD. That is a different proposition. That is an interallied parliament. This is an organization that existed before the war.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is the one I have reference to. Did we at any time send delegates? They met once at St. Louis, did they not?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Did we at any time send delegates to that union?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], who, I think, was chairman of that convention, can tell you all about it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. A good many of the French and English and Italian members told me that this body took no interest in this Interparliamentary Union, and they were complaining of that fact.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, we have an appropriation in this bill to provide for a meeting in this country.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman from New York desire an explanation?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will give him in a few words the history of the organization. In 1888 certain members of the French and English Parliaments met in Paris and organized an association known originally as the Interparliamentary Union for the Promotion of Arbitration. The title was so long as to be awkward, and it was reduced to Interparliamentary Union. That organization has been actively engaged ever since 1888 in promoting arbitration and the justifiable settlement of international disputes. As to the central bureau, the Government of Italy is an adhering and supporting member, and so are France and Great Britain, and before the war Germany and Austria and other countries as well. Before the war a central bureau was established in Brussels with Mr. Christian Lange as secretary. I am not certain on this point, but I think that each of these Governments, with the exception of Austria-Hungary, Germany, Bulgaria, and Turkey, have been contributing during the whole war to keep up the organization. There has not been a meeting of the union since 1913, which was held at The Hague. There was to have been a meeting in Sweden in 1914 and delegates went, but something happened, as the gentleman knows, and the meeting was not held.

As to delegates, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] said, any Member can go and can be a delegate and participate in the proceedings of the union who cares to go. It would not be possible to get an appropriation to transport delegates to an association of this kind, because it would be too expensive an undertaking with no limitation on the number of delegates who might go.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What is the purpose of the \$2,000 appropriation?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is to help maintain the central bureau. All of these countries in which there is a group of the union make a contribution toward its support. Italy gives not quite so much as the United States—probably about \$1,200.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Do they have a publication?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wanted to bring out the facts. The members of the parliaments that I met when abroad complained that we were not sufficiently active in it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think the gentleman has confused it with the Interallied Parliament, which was purely for war purposes and restricted to three or four countries.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE.

For the payment of the quota of the United States for the support of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1920, \$8,000;

For salary of one member of the permanent committee of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1920, \$3,600;

For the payment of the quota of the United States for the cost of translating into and printing in the English language the publications of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, \$5,000;

Total, \$16,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the item that almost failed in the other body at the last session. I believe it was resuscitated by the close vote of one.

Now, since the illustrious promoter of this item, the Hon. David Lubin, who had his genesis, I believe, in California, has passed to the other land, does the gentleman think there is much need of continuing this appropriation?

Mr. FLOOD. I think the agriculturists of the country think this Institute of Agriculture is of great benefit to them. Our adherence to it is by treaty. The appropriations are made in accordance with the treaty of 1905, signed by ourselves and 40 other powers.

Mr. STAFFORD. What information, may I ask, is furnished to the Government of the United States that is not already possessed by the Agricultural Department?

Mr. FLOOD. Well, it furnishes the farmers of the country with a great deal of information about European methods of marketing, and the suggestions of marketing systems made by the Institute of Agriculture have, as I understand, been adopted by the bureau of markets of a good many States, and I know they hold the institute in very high esteem, and held Mr. Lubin in very high esteem.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Is it not a fact that since this bill was framed Mr. Lubin has died?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. And is it not a fact that for many years this has been very largely a one-man undertaking, that one man being Mr. Lubin?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think so. Mr. Lubin, as I understand, went to Rome at his own expense and organized an institute, and then after he had organized it he drew to his assistance the farmers of 41 countries, which countries sent representatives to a conference and made a treaty and established this present Institute of Agriculture. He was put at the head of it. For a number of years, being a man of wealth at that time, he did not ask any salary and did not receive any. Subsequently I understood he lost a good deal of his fortune, and we voted him \$3,600. But the institute has developed from the time it was a one-man affair, and I happen to know from agricultural organizations in this country that they hold this institute and the work it does as of very great value to agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do you know in what estimate it is held by the officials of the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Houston, the Secretary of Agriculture, holds it in the highest esteem, as he did Mr. Lubin, and I understand the Department of Agriculture regards the institute as being very beneficial to the agricultural interests of the country.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under the impression that all the practical men connected with the Department of Agriculture regard this as merely a useless appendage, of no value whatsoever to the farmers of this country, but merely of value to the founder, Mr. Lubin. Now that he has passed away I suppose there will be an effort made to discontinue this work, because I question whether it has any real value.

Mr. FLOOD. We will have to abrogate the treaty, and I think you will find the farmers of the country, and particularly the organized farmers, will make a great protest against abrogating the treaty, doing away with the International Institute of Agriculture.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the effort made to discontinue it, which was nearly successful in another body last year, will be successful this year. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA.

Judge, \$8,000; district attorney, \$4,000; marshal, \$3,000; clerk, \$3,000; stenographer, \$1,800; printing and binding opinions of the court, \$1,000; court expenses, including reference law books, \$9,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 15, line 2. This amendment was adopted by the committee, and in some way was omitted from the printed bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the figures "\$9,000," on page 15, line 2, insert: "In the settlement of salaries for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, by the disbursing officer to the officials of the United States Court for China the same rate of exchange used in the payment of salaries to consular officials in China for said fiscal year is hereby authorized and approved, these settlements to be made from the total amount for salaries and court expenses for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1918, and June 30, 1919."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think some information should be given as to the reason for this provision.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, for some reason the bill which appropriated the money for the court officials for China, and for the Consular Service as well, omitted to make provision for that court, as it did for the Consular Service, in the matter of the changing rates of exchange in China.

Just before the war the rate of exchange was \$2.59 Mexican for \$1 American, and it has gone down to such an extent that it is now \$1.15 Mexican of silver for \$1 American. The State Department of the Government saw that it was impossible for these men to get along on their salaries with this rate of exchange, which cut their salaries more than half. They accordingly paid the Consular Service at an established exchange rate of 43 cents American for \$1 Mexican, which they adopted.

Now, according to an order issued by the department, or instruction issued, the United States court officials for China were paid at the same rate as they had always been paid, but when the year was up the Treasury Department refused to accept that rate for the court officials, because they said they had not been specifically mentioned in the bill, as the Consular Service had been, and the consequence is that, although these men have received their money according to the orders of the State Department at the same rate the Consular Service received it, they are now asked to make good that difference, and must do so unless this amendment is adopted.

Now, they were paid, as I say, according to the consular rate. They are all Government officials in the same place, and some of them occupy the very same building. Had not the Treasury Department or the State Department made that mistake and paid them according to the rate which they had established of 43 cents, these men could have gone along and received their salary according to the prevailing rate; but the rate has been falling constantly, and now we would be taking advantage of them, because they had been told that we would pay them according to the rate established by the department, and then later, at the end of the year, we say, "We can not pay you according to that rate because the bill does not provide for it," and then ask these men to go on the market and make good that difference at a very high rate of exchange, now about \$1.15 Mexican for \$1 American. It would be a very great hardship on them.

In fact, I am more closely in touch with the Attorney General for the court, and he tells me that it would take an entire year's salary to make good this difference, whereas if he had been paid according to the rate which prevailed at the time it would have made a difference of probably \$1,500 or \$1,600 to him in his salary. The year 1919 was provided for, but the provision was omitted for the fiscal year ending June, 1918. This would simply place the court officials in China on the same basis as the Consular Service and on the same basis they have always been. They have always been paid according to the consular rate of payment, and this is merely to rectify a mistake which Congress made and not penalize them because of an omission by Congress and a misinterpretation or error from the State Department.

Mr. Holcomb tells us in his testimony:

Mr. COOPER. What percentage of loss was there?

Mr. HOLCOMB. When I went there we got \$2.59 for each gold dollar, and then it went down to \$1.33, and now it is \$1.15. If we do not get relief, we will have to buy the silver and pay it back, and that will take about \$3,600 gold, one whole year's salary, to repay that, and it was not our fault that the mistake was made. I am penalized every day. I assure you, gentlemen, that the money was taken by the officers of the court under the mistaken idea that they had been taken care of.

It would merely rectify a mistake which Congress made, and pay them according to the consular rate, which they had always been receiving.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in the existing act there is specific provision made for the payment of the exchange?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The rate is established by the department, which is 43 cents American for \$1 Mexican. That was provided in the emergency bill or the general deficiency bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are there any other instances where the conditions cited by the gentleman apply to persons connected with the Diplomatic and Consular Service?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; there are none that I know of.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] mentioned to me a very similar case in Persia.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There are similar conditions in Persia, India, and China, and I am sure that the gentleman will agree with me that in certain other portions of the earth where the silver standard dollar is in vogue the price of silver has been going up rapidly, and therefore relatively the value of the American dollar has been declining, and the condition

throughout China and the Orient extends down into the Dutch East Indies and into India. It is even found in Japan, although in a much less degree, because Japan has the gold standard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The silver dollar has been going up in value relatively, and the condition in China is probably worst of all. It has reached a point where unless something like this is done our men there absolutely can not live on their salaries. The judge instead of getting \$8,000 will be getting \$4,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the effect of this amendment is retroactive, that the future is provided for.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Yes. The Department of State, recognizing that situation, took care of the diplomatic and consular officers in China and elsewhere out of post allowances, and under the impression that the provision of law authorized them to take care of the court officials in China, because the appropriation is contained in the diplomatic bill, they extended the same privileges to the court for China, but later found that they had no legislative authority for doing so, and this is to validate their action. I am sure everyone in possession of the facts will agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] that this is a very necessary and essential thing to do. It means almost the very life of the judicial tribunal in China. If after two or three years there comes to be a parity between the silver dollar and the gold dollar, of course this will not be necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, as I understand, this amendment takes care of a condition that existed some years ago.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. That is entirely true, and the law now takes care of their salaries for this year and the year to come.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This does not involve any additional appropriation. These men have already received the money, and they received it according to the rate established by the department. Had they been told at that time that they were not entitled to it the difference in the rate at that time was not so great; but now to compel them to turn back this money which has already been paid them will be a great hardship, because they will have to go into the market and purchase it at the present low rate of exchange, which will penalize them for acting in good faith with the department. It will penalize one man \$3,800, because the department had misinformed him. The gentleman from Wisconsin was asking whether there were any other cases. I do not think there is any other case on record or in existence where the department has told these people that they were entitled to it when they were not and then demands repayment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And where the department afterwards told them they were not entitled to it and asked them to refund.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I thought the gentleman's query was in reference to the recent rise in the value of silver.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. This is the only case of this kind that I know of.

Mr. STAFFORD. My inquiry was directed to the point whether this would be a precedent for other cases.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; there are no other cases.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The judge of the said court and the district attorney shall, when the sessions of the court are held at other cities than Shanghai, receive in addition to their salaries their necessary actual expenses during such sessions, not to exceed \$8 per day each, and so much as may be necessary for said purposes during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, is hereby appropriated:
Total, \$29,800.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I notice that the committee have raised the allowance that may be paid to the judge and the district attorney when absent from their stations from \$5 a day to \$8 a day. I am unacquainted absolutely with conditions existing in China, but I was under the impression that living there cost much less than in the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. The information we get is that it is the most expensive place in the world just now.

Mr. STAFFORD. Even more so than the city of Washington?

Mr. FLOOD. I understand very much more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then you ought to double this amount if that is the case. That is a pretty strong statement to make. On what authority does the gentleman make such a strong statement, that the cost of living in China is greater than in the city of Washington?

Mr. ROGERS. I should like to refer the gentleman to page 139 of the hearings, where there is printed a report from one of our consular inspectors who had at that time just returned from a tour of inspection in the Far East. He says:

No inspector can now travel in the Far Eastern inspection district without paying from his own pocket one-third or more of the actual necessary and unavoidable expenses of subsistence for himself and really one-third of the total expense, exclusive of telegrams. He is limited to an average of United States \$5 per day for subsistence (in making which the days not spent in hotels are not allowed to be used in computing the total number of days to be averaged). This in a district where at almost no port can three meals, a bed, and a bath be obtained for less than United States \$7 to United States \$8, and cost United States \$15 to United States \$25 at many of the larger places. Hotels at Kobe and Yokohama now charge from United States \$7.50 to United States \$10 (15 to 20 yen) per day, at Shanghai United States \$16.20 (Mexican \$18) and up, and at Hongkong United States \$18 to United States \$22 (Mexican \$20 to Mexican \$24). In addition, one has necessary tips and laundry to pay, as well as numerous other charges, which the auditor classes as subsistence.

I have in my hand a letter which came to me yesterday from the judge of the United States Court for China. I may say that it is a tribute to the postal service of some country—it may be China's or it may be Mr. Burleson's—that that letter, which is dated October 11, 1918, reached me yesterday after a transit of three and one-half months from Shanghai.

Mr. STAFFORD. Give the credit to the man in America who deserves it so much.

Mr. ROGERS. Judge Lobingier writes:

It is impossible at the present time to journey in China at an expense of \$5 a day. I have just returned from holding a special session at Tientsin, where my expenses, with the most rigid economy, will amount to more than three times that figure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT TO THE GOVERNMENT OF PANAMA.

To enable the Secretary of State to pay to the Government of Panama the eighth annual payment due on February 26, 1920, from the Government of the United States to the Government of Panama under article 14 of the treaty of November 18, 1903, \$250,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This annuity of \$250,000 for Panama raises the question as to the business transaction of the building of the Panama Canal. Has the chairman any figures as to the amount of business that goes through the canal and as to its profits?

Mr. FLOOD. I have not.

Mr. FESS. I do not want to take up the time of the House on this matter of information, but I was wondering whether the business is growing or not.

Mr. FLOOD. I have no information in regard to it whatever.

Mr. FESS. I will take no time, then. I thought the chairman might have the figures. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriation of \$15,000 for the payment of compensation to and the necessary expenses of the representative or representatives of the United States on the International Commission of Jurists, organized under the convention signed at the Third International American Conference August 23, 1906, approved by the Senate February 3, 1908, and ratified by the President February 8, 1908, for the purpose of preparing drafts of codes of public and private international law; and for the payment of the quota of the United States of the expenses incident to the preparation of such drafts, including the compensation of experts under article 4 of the convention, made in the act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and extended and made available for the fiscal years 1916, 1917, 1918, and 1919, not having been expended, is hereby extended and made available for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman what progress has been made in regard to codifying international law, as provided for in this paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD. No progress has been made in the last three years. The work has been entirely suspended. The conference has done no work since the European war began.

Mr. FESS. The chairman will remember that a meeting was held by representative international lawyers, and they recommended some sort of a code, and when we published a compilation of documents on the restraint of trade that particular recommendation was included in the document. Secretary Lansing told me in a conference over the matter that it had not received the approval of the State Department; in fact, he had never seen it, and therefore it could not bear the insignia of our own country. I was wondering whether that was the product at all of this proposed expense.

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. FESS. That seems to have been merely voluntary.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I was out of the House a short time, and I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if any provision is made for the increase in the salary of consuls?

Mr. FLOOD. We have just got to it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the committee follow the recommendation of the State Department?

Mr. FLOOD. The committee did.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES OF THE CONSULAR SERVICE.

For salaries of consuls general, consuls, and vice consuls, as provided in the act approved February 5, 1915, entitled "An act for the improvement of the foreign service," and for economic assistants at salaries of not more than \$5,000 each per annum, \$1,974.500. Every consul general, consul, vice consul, and, wherever practicable, every consular agent shall be an American citizen.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 21, line 3, strike out the words "wherever practicable."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HASTINGS). The Clerk will report the amendment. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin insist on his point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may and I may not.

Mr. AUSTIN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. That there is legislation in the paragraph not provided for in existing law. If it will accommodate the gentleman from Tennessee for me to make the point of order now, I will do so. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is quite willing that I do not press the point of order at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not withdrawn my point of order, Mr. Chairman. I wish to inquire as to these new positions of economic assistants as provided for in this paragraph.

Mr. FLOOD. They are to be expert commercial men to be attached to the consulates in different parts of the world for the purpose of advancing our trade in those countries. There are 25 of them provided for in the bill. They perform a similar function in the consulates that the commercial attachés do at the embassies.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, may I interject a suggestion there? I understand the consular agents are appointed by the consul general. They are appointed in any town where there is no consul and where it is necessary that there should be some representative. That is what a consular agent is. The gentleman is asking about page 21, is he not?

Mr. STAFFORD. Line 1, economic assistants.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this work of the development of our foreign commerce is lodged with the Department of Commerce. In the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill authorization is made for the employment of a number of additional commercial agents. There should not be duplication of work. It is true that the Consular Service performs some work of aid in the expansion of our foreign commerce; but there should not be any duplication of work, nor should there be any rivalry between two departments of the Government. We have the assurance of the Secretary of Commerce that there is no rivalry, so far as the heads of those departments are concerned. It is a great work that is being performed by the Department of Commerce. A million dollars nearly is being expended under the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. Because I believe there should be no overlapping of activities, no duplication of work, I am going to insist upon the point of order to that part of the paragraph—

and for economic assistants at salaries of not more than \$5,000 each per annum.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman from Tennessee desires me to withhold the point of order for a moment I shall do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I was connected with the Consular Service before entering Congress, and I have always taken an interest in legislation affecting that service. While it is quite true, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] states, that the Department of Commerce has its representatives in various foreign countries, I believe, in all seriousness, the work recommended by the State Department is vitally important and will be a splendid investment. The Department of Commerce, for instance, had, when I was in the Orient four years ago, one commercial attaché for all of China, a country larger in extent than America, with more than 400,000,000 of people. The task to be performed by one man was absolutely out of the question, and we had a very capable man in that division and

still have, but it was impossible for him to care for all the commercial interests in that section of the world. There will be no duplication of work if this plan so well worked out by the State Department is carried forward. There will be cooperation between the Department of Commerce and the State Department. We have not given the Department of Commerce a sufficient force of men to cover all foreign countries where we are going to seek to extend American trade with our new and modern merchant marine which we propose to establish and maintain for the advancement of the business interests of America. The State Department and the Department of Commerce will act jointly in this matter, and will place these new officials where they will render needed and valuable service. Knowing as I do the Director of Consuls, Mr. Wilber J. Carr, I want to say that there is not a better equipped or more conscientious official in the service of the Government. I have visited the State Department with a view of looking into the program which they propose to inaugurate if this legislation is going to be granted, and I appeal to the gentleman from Wisconsin not to insist upon his point of order. I do so realizing that if he understood as I understand, and had made an examination as I have, there would not be in his mind the slightest doubt that this proposed legislation is for the benefit of our country. I have always found the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] open to reason, and I sincerely trust that he will let this legislation go forward. I am about to close a 10-year service in this House—

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, I am in the same position as the gentleman in that respect, with a little longer service to my credit.

Mr. AUSTIN. No more important piece of legislation in the way of an amendment to an appropriation bill has ever been proposed to Congress than this. I am in earnest about this, and I hope that the gentleman from Wisconsin will not insist upon his point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is not my privilege to lay claim to the parentage of any legislative child. Nevertheless the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as carried in the legislative appropriation bill, has received my close study ever since I have been a member of the subcommittee reporting that bill. It is a subject very dear to my heart, and I want to see that bureau increase in its activities. Because of my interest in it, because of my study—and I have studied it closely—and because I believe that this work is merely duplication and will overlap—

Mr. FLOOD. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order for a moment? To what does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order to the language—

and for economic assistants at salaries of not more than \$5,000 each per annum.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist upon it?

Mr. STAFFORD. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which I send to the desk, which I will ask the Clerk to read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 3, after the word "and" strike out the words "wherever practicable."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I had above five years' experience in the Consular Service a good many years ago. It has been my experience that wherever we have had a consular agent not a citizen of the United States the work was not performed to the best interests of this country. It is very frequently abused, because it is used to further personal or social ambitions. I know the chairman will tell me that it is very difficult to find American citizens to go to small places as consular agents because there is no salary and the fees in some places do not amount to much. I believe it has been the practice to detail clerks to such small places and appoint them consular agents. That is one way of getting around it. If the place is so unimportant that we can not afford to pay a man, let us have nobody there. I am very strong for keeping everybody who is not a citizen of the United States out of the Consular Service. I would even go as far as messengers and clerks. I can not understand why we should have a consular representative in a foreign country who is not a citizen of the United States.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered that very carefully. The committee has done a great deal to Americanize the entire Consular Service, but the committee did not think, and the State Department does not think, it would be wise in reference to these assistants to so legislate that it would be

impossible at any time to employ a person who was not an American citizen, and it does not do so whenever it is possible to get an American citizen; but there are a few cases when it is not possible, and therefore we leave those words "whenever practicable" in there. The committee has done everything in its power to Americanize the entire consular system.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. These words "whenever practicable" apply only to consular agents; that runs to the port—

Mr. FLOOD. It may.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then, in every instance, why should we be represented in any part of this world by any man who is not an American citizen?

Mr. FLOOD. There are some ports where it could not be possible to get an American citizen to go upon the salary given them.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then abolish the office.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman desires to abolish these offices, let him make a motion to abolish them.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the gentleman in seeking to Americanize in every possible way our Consular Service. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has gone a little further, each year I have been on the committee, to bring about that entirely beneficial result. I have been somewhat active in the several steps. This year we are taking a step further than we have ever taken before in that for the first time we absolutely require that every vice consul shall be an American citizen. Previously we had stipulated that "whenever practicable" every vice consul or consular agent should be an American citizen. We have not hitherto made it absolutely a rule of law in the appointment and retention of vice consuls. This bill for the first time does that. I very much hope that it will be possible in the immediate future to make every consular agent representing this country abroad an American citizen. Most of them are American citizens now. I should say about one-third of them are still foreigners. This bill in this very item which we are now discussing provides for the creation of 150 career vice consuls. If the gentleman will look at the hearings on page 108 he will find a tabulation submitted to the committee by Mr. Carr, showing how the appropriation asked for in this bill of nearly \$2,000,000 for consular salaries is to be divided. The last three items of the tabulation show that there are to be 50 vice consuls of class 1 at \$3,000, 50 vice consuls of class 2 at \$2,500, and 50 vice consuls of class 3 at \$2,000. Those vice consuls are to be placed in the positions which are now pretty generally occupied by consular agents. The intention of the State Department and the intention of the committee is that these men shall supersede non-American consular agents in every post where there is a real volume of business, where there are American interests of any importance.

At the same time there are some posts where American trade is of such small magnitude and of such small consequence that it would not be economically desirable, it would not be advantageous from a business point of view, to appoint a \$2,000 or a \$2,500 or a \$3,000 vice consul and put him in that position to administer the very small volume of American trade which is there. I have taken from the latest register of the Department of State some of the places where the volume of business done by our consular agents is very small. Take the case of Caldera, Chile, where the total annual volume of fees taken in by our consular agent there for the fiscal year ended June, 1917, was \$92. At Cruz Grande, in Chile, the annual volume of business was \$91; at Camaguey, Cuba, \$42.50; at Boulogne sur Mer, \$67.50; at Dunkirk, \$48; at Dieppe, \$92.50; at St. Vincent, in the West Indies, \$69; at Freemantle, Australia, \$71.50; at Townsville, Queensland, \$78.50; and at Flushing, Netherlands, \$27.50. When we come to Oaxaca, Mexico, the volume of business was \$2.50 a year, and at Bloemfontein, South Africa, there is a magnificent total for the year of \$1.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. I want to ask him some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, that, I say, is the total volume of business done at the several places. The salary, the munificent salary, which our consular agent receives is in each case one-half the amount that I have read. Those places are not unique. I could enumerate a number of others where the total fees collected are less than \$100, and where the consular agent's salary is consequently anywhere from 50 cents to \$50. Now, under those circumstances I think the Committee on Foreign Affairs feels, and I think this committee would agree that it would not be a

wise, businesslike policy, while entirely in accord with the purpose of the gentleman from New York, that we should lay down as a rigid rule that every one of those people must be replaced by a permanent official at a salary of \$2,000 or more.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield.

Mr. TEMPLE. Speaking of the volume of business, does that mean the total volume of business done by American citizens or the total value of fees collected by the consular agent?

Mr. ROGERS. The latter is what I should have said. The figures read represent the fees taken in at the several places I have enumerated.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Those fees are constituted from consular invoices, bills of lading, applications for passports, and so forth. Now, is it not true the consul's business is the protection of American trade and to look out for opportunities for American capital, and is it not true that a consular agent has a district sometimes as large as that of a consul general?

And is it not also true that he has access to commercial reports and confidential information concerning our industry and commerce? And is it not dangerous and against the interests of American industry to have them representing the business interests of this country in foreign ports?

Mr. ROGERS. That is rather an elaborate question, but I would say, generally, the answer is "Yes." At the same time the alternative, when we get to a post of the type I have enumerated, is either that we shall have nobody or that we shall have a foreigner. It would not be wise to close those agencies. My opinion is that it would be a misfortune to the United States to maintain a foreigner there a moment longer than is necessary. But you can not get an American citizen to go out there for any sum which is at all commensurate with the importance of the place. We are wisely Americanizing the service very rapidly, but it can not be done in a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment. I wish to say a word in favor of this amendment. It was my privilege at one time to appoint seven of these consular agents. Four of them were Arabs, who could not speak a word of English. Now, you can imagine, gentlemen, very readily, I think, how anybody would feel that wandered up to an American consular office, seeing the eagle sign there, and finding an Arab that could not speak a word of English in charge of the American interests. In the first place, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] suggested, it is a dangerous thing to do. You do not know who they are. They might be friends of America and they might not be. They have access to American records. I know of one instance where a man spoke good English and was a member of a nation as civilized as ours, who was at Port Said, and, as a matter of fact, his interests were absolutely opposed, diametrically opposed, to those of American business men, and he would injure our business undoubtedly. I visited him and suggested his removal to the department. You can not follow these fellows around and check them up. It is a dangerous proposition. There is only one way for this Republic to do, and that is to put American citizens on guard and make them understand what America is. All that business can be done by correspondence with the consul, a little way off. That matter can all be handled. If you lost a little business down there, you would not lose as much as if you were to put your business in improper hands.

I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

I do not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] in reference to this amendment.

I have contended here in Congress for an increase in the salaries of consuls and consular clerks and for substituting Americans for foreigners wherever they were available in the Consular Service, and for the last 10 years the Committee on Appropriations and the State Department have been working out that solution.

Now, when I was appointed consul to Glasgow, Scotland, the vice consul for 20 years was a native of Great Britain. I immediately made an investigation and found an American citizen and had him appointed as vice consul. But in that consular district there were two consular agencies located where we were without American citizens, and it meant either the re-appointment or the continuation of the men in the service with good records or an abolishment of the offices. And the official fees were insignificant. They would not sustain an American, and no American could afford to leave the United States to accept the appointments.

Mr. LITTLE. Permit me to suggest that the gentleman's experience was among people of the same type as our own, and it was much easier to find somebody of a sympathetic character there than in Siam or in South America or Mexico. Foreigners acquire disrespect for America by seeing such people in charge as I have referred to. In your district the consular work would have been done through your office.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think not; not without great inconvenience, trouble, and expense to the interested parties.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to abolish consular agencies, then we must provide an appropriation which will carry salaries which will justify Americans in accepting appointments or practically do a great hardship to people who are interested and must use this service. And we certainly ought not to do this without the recommendation of the State Department, charged with the responsibility for this service.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be unwise to adopt this amendment. This bill is carrying a well-worked-out plan of the State Department for the reorganization of the Consular Service, and that plan provides for the absolute abolition, as soon as it can be accomplished, of these consular agents. They propose to increase the service by 150 vice consuls, who are to take the place of the consular agents; but that may take some months after this law goes into effect, and during that time it is best to leave the consular agents where they are, whether they are American citizens or not. They have in the service now 127 consular agents, many of whom are not American citizens. The very purpose of this increased appropriation is to get rid of all these people and authorize the State Department to appoint 150 vice consuls, who will take the place of the consular agents. Therefore, until that plan is worked out, it is unwise to hamper the administration in the carrying out of the plan which they have carefully and laboriously formulated. I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, there are a good many men in the service who are growing old, and as they grow older they become inefficient. The promotions in the Consular Service are rather slow, and we have, perhaps, in some important posts now men who are beyond 75 years of age. What is the policy of the department as to getting more active and younger men in these higher places and putting aside the older men who are not able to do the work?

Mr. FLOOD. They are under the civil service, and there is no law compelling them to retire and you can not put them out.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. As time goes on we will have in Paris, London, Rome, and all these places men who have grown old in the service and who can not do the work. Does not the gentleman believe some provision should be made for these men so that we can promote those who are able to do the work?

Mr. FLOOD. It might be wise to give the Department of State the right to retire them at a certain age.

Mr. AUSTIN. We can take care of them under the general bill that is now pending in Congress, to provide retirement for the civil employees of the Government. This is another reason why that measure should pass.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I think the department will be embarrassed on account of the existing situation.

Mr. FLOOD. We have nothing in the bill on that subject.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I shall detain the House for only a few minutes, and I must apologize in advance for a brief reference to a proposed item in this bill which the House has predetermined not to entertain. I refer to the matter of legation buildings. Fifteen years ago I proposed such a bill. In fact, I introduced the bill in two or three Congresses, and I believe it would be wise to enact it now. I think we ought to provide reasonable homes for our diplomatic representatives abroad. I do not believe that we ought to provide palaces, because a man with an income limited to \$17,500 a year, the salary of an ambassador, would hardly be comfortable in a \$500,000 residence, and I oppose that feature of the bill. But we ought to make some provision for them, because it is scandalous and inexcusable, in my judgment, that these high diplomatic positions can only go as a rule to gentlemen of means who contribute largely to presidential campaign funds. Without legation buildings poor men, however talented, can not generally accept high diplomatic appointments. The sin rests on both parties alike. There is no difference in

that respect. It is a scandalous fact that these great appointments to exalted diplomatic rank should go to the heavy contributors to campaign funds.

And, Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word with regard to the intimations I have heard in this debate that we should have a trained diplomatic corps. I am inclined to think that we ought to have a permanent consular force, but I do not believe we ought to have a permanent diplomatic corps. If we do, we are going to find that under the meager salaries paid to the subordinate officers in the Diplomatic Service we will soon have promoted from the positions of secretary and attaché only the sons of very rich men, and then we will get them in these places even without contributions to campaign funds. I do not believe in it. Moreover, my observation and limited experience in travel are that the underofficers in the diplomatic stations are not usually men preeminently qualified for the positions. They know the conventions, of course, and are, I dare say, courteous to their own caste, but too frequently not so to their traveling fellow countrymen. Some of the greatest representatives that we have ever had abroad were men without diplomatic training. Benjamin Franklin had never had any. Adams had never had any of any consequence, nor had Phelps nor Bayard nor Lowell, to come down to more recent times. Yet these are names that have shed luster on the Diplomatic Service of this country. I am pleased to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have recently had appointed to the post of ambassador to London a man of a very high order of ability, with whom many of us are personally acquainted.

I believe that the standard fixed by Adams and Lowell and Phelps and Bayard and others at the Court of St. James will be maintained in every respect by John W. Davis, recently appointed. [Applause.] I know him to be a man of high character. We all know him to be a man of great ability. He has already made for himself a position as a speaker, and a gracious, agreeable personality, and in his care the affairs of our Government of a diplomatic nature will be just as safe as they ever were in the hands of anyone. I am told that a distinguished citizen of the State of Ohio, formerly a Member of this House, will soon retire from the Diplomatic Service. I refer to our present ambassador to France. I regret that circumstances have made it appear necessary to Mr. Sharp to retire from that position at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Most of us recall with some degree of pain the severe, almost insulting, criticism that was made by his enemies when he was suggested for that position. I would not take a single leaf from the laurels gathered by his predecessor, but most of us who have watched the career of our former colleague in Paris will agree that the occupancy of that great position by Mr. Sharp has been with as much usefulness and as much distinction and as much credit to the country as that of any of his predecessors. [Applause.] He is a typical, high-class, clear-headed, common-sense American citizen, the sort of representative a republic should have, a man of ample dignity; he is educated, and I congratulate the country and I congratulate—I was going to say the Democratic Party, but it is not a political position—I congratulate the people and all political parties that we have had such a diplomatic representative of the American citizenry at Paris during these trying times, and I think we feel that there is a loss to the Diplomatic Service and to the country when he retires. [Applause.] He has conducted himself with tact and dignity, and he will retire with honor.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPENSES OF CONSULAR INSPECTORS.

For the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of consular inspectors while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, \$25,000: *Provided*, That inspectors shall be allowed actual and necessary expenses for subsistence, itemized, not exceeding an average of \$8 per day.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think this ought to become a law, and I trust that my colleague will not raise the point of order, for this reason: The testimony before our committee as to the expenses over there that these inspectors have to meet was astonishing. For example, hotels in Kobe and Yokohama, Japan, now charge \$7.50 to \$10 a day in United States money, which is gold. At Shanghai they charge

\$16.20 a day to \$18 a day in gold. At Hongkong they charge \$18 to \$22 a day in gold.

Mr. STAFFORD. That information was called to the attention of the House in connection with the item providing for an increase of allowances for the judge and the district attorney to the court of the United States in Shanghai.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was at my office at that time and did not know of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rose to make an inquiry as to the peculiar phraseology of this allowance. It is not in the customary phraseology "not to exceed \$8 a day," but "not to exceed an average of \$8 a day." I do not recall a similar authorization where we have granted a per diem allowance for expense of subsistence.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. My understanding is that in some places they can possibly get subsistence and accommodation for less than \$8 and in others you can not get it for less than twice that sum. Therefore the committee used the word "average."

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose under this authorization it is the purpose to allow an inspector a greater amount than \$8 a day if for the year it does not average more than that amount. Has the gentleman any information as to what the average expenditure is?

Mr. FLOOD. Let me say that the average expenditure for these gentlemen, especially those in the East, would be more than \$8 a day. Those in Europe and South American countries would be \$8 a day, probably.

Mr. STAFFORD. In one bill, the legislative, we are only authorizing a per diem expenditure of \$5 a day. Here you authorize not a per diem of \$8, but an average throughout the year of \$8.

Mr. FLOOD. These gentlemen do a very valuable work, and it is difficult to keep them in this branch of the service. They are on the move all the time. Eight dollars a day was thought to be enough to cover their expenses and not too much in all the countries except the East, and the department insisted on \$10 a day in that section. The men are constantly on the go and want to get out of this branch of the service and get into the regular Consular Service. They have five men and they want to add two more to them. They are very efficient men and they want to keep them there. They have to go into their salaries to help pay their expenses.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Virginia will remember that Mr. Carr in that connection told the committee of one of these inspectors, by the name of Fuller, who had not had but one leave of absence, and that a very short one, in five or six years; that he had been traveling all the time and been imploring the department to give him a place somewhere where his labors would be reduced. He also said the system of auditing the accounts of these inspectors is so exceedingly strict that it is almost impossible for them to work any fraud on the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, impressed with the information furnished by my colleague, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President, in his discretion and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to consular and diplomatic officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living at the posts to which they may be assigned, \$700,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. I reserve all points of order. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Under this provision, as I understand it, it is the purpose to add to the laws of the land the proposition to make it possible for the President or the State Department, by his direction I presume, to overcome the difficulties that have arisen among our consuls and diplomats abroad, because of the increased cost of living during the war. That is the purpose, is it not?

Mr. FLOOD. During the war and for the time immediately after the war; yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Is there any legislation now on the statute books upon which this is predicated, or is this new legislation?

Mr. FLOOD. This is entirely new legislation.

Mr. LITTLE. Then it would be out of order.

Mr. FLOOD. It is subject to the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. I reserve that point of order. I want to ask as to the facts. In certain locations, by reason of the war, the American dollar has ceased to have the value it did, and, therefore, a consul or a minister does not get actually the same

amount of money that he did before. Is not that the fact? The rate of exchange has changed, in other words. I am reliably informed that the State Department now sees its way clear under statutes which have been passed to assist the consular officers, but not the diplomatic representatives. Does the gentleman consider that under this provision it would enable the President, if he saw fit, to obviate that difficulty and adjust a man's income out of this \$700,000 so that it would overcome the decreased value of the dollar?

Mr. FLOOD. A minister, I think, could possibly be embraced within the term "diplomatic officers," but I would say to the gentleman that it is not the policy of the department or of the President to do it, and I do not believe it would be the policy of the House.

Mr. LITTLE. If it is the policy of the President and the House to assist the Consular Service, why not the Diplomatic?

Mr. FLOOD. It is a little different kind of service. It is a business service, a permanent service. Those men go into it for a life work, and the increased cost of living came on them; and if they had no means of their own, many would have to give up their life's work. An ambassador or a minister under our system has not adopted that for his life work. It is true that men in lower grades of the Diplomatic Service probably have, but the ambassadors and ministers are special appointees, to hold for an administration or two administrations. They accept the places with the understanding that they have to bear a certain financial burden in doing it, and are more prepared to meet emergencies.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman realizes that some of them in the smaller appointments are poor men.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; and, realizing that, we undertook to make a provision here so that homes could be built for them. I do not believe that it met with the gentleman's approval.

Mr. LITTLE. That would not assist them. The Government pays the rent now.

Mr. FLOOD. No; it does not.

Mr. LITTLE. I know that it does, because I have been in the service.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman knows that, he has information that every official in the State Department will tell him is inaccurate.

Mr. LITTLE. I expect that is true, because they have not been there; but every one of them lives in the agency or the consulate that the Government rents for them.

Mr. FLOOD. Every ambassador and minister that we have does that?

Mr. LITTLE. Every consul does, that I ever visited.

Mr. FLOOD. I was not talking about the consuls.

Mr. LITTLE. And it is the same way with the ministers to the smaller countries, or was. The Government rents an office for them, and it is of such proportions that they can live in it. The gentleman is technically correct, that the Government does not rent houses for them, but the Government rents their offices and they live in them, being allowed formerly, and probably now, something like 20 per cent of their salaries for such rent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, and I desire to offer an amendment—

Mr. STAFFORD. I renew the point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. Oh, I am keeping it up.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman can not if he offers an amendment. I wish to inquire whether the gentleman is insistent on having this made a permanent authorization, regardless of the existing war.

Mr. FLOOD. Does the wording of the provision make it that?

Mr. STAFFORD. In the phraseology of the paragraph under consideration you eliminate the limitation carried in the existing act—

during the pendency of the existing war and for six months after its termination.

Mr. FLOOD. No; that would be a very good amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, if the gentleman is willing to have that incorporated in the bill I withdraw the reservation of the point of order. I believe there should be some limitation.

Mr. RAGSDALE. If the chairman will permit me, does not the gentleman think that so long as this condition of affairs exists abroad by which the American dollar will not buy a dollar's worth that the President of the United States ought to be able to make up that difference in our ministers' salaries, to meet that condition of affairs necessarily changed at the termination of this war or immediately afterwards?

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the rearrangement of salaries is a matter for permanent legislation. You are attempting that so far as the consular officers are concerned. I believe this bill by increasing the appropriation some \$700,000—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, this appropriation was originally intended only for a temporary purpose?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. To provide for an allowance occasioned by the high cost of living occasioned by the war?

Mr. RAGSDALE. And occasioned by the fact that the American dollar abroad no longer buys a dollar's worth in every country in which it is spent.

Mr. STAFFORD. Changes are being made. The price of Argentine wheat in Liverpool is \$1.55, and prices are bound to come down in this country and throughout the world, but as this provision was temporary I think it should be continued temporarily; in fact, as the gentleman remembers, it only applied originally to those countries where the war was in progress and to countries contiguous thereto, and then it was subsequently extended. Now, all that is desired is to provide for its application during the pendency of the existing war and then provide thereafter—

Mr. RAGSDALE. Well, suppose the gentleman offers his amendment to that effect.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order, with the understanding it has the approval—

Mr. FLOOD. Is the gentleman going to offer the amendment?

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve it for the time being at the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

Mr. LITTLE. I understand I have the floor.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. LITTLE. The regular order is that I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin make the point of order?

Mr. LITTLE. Does the Chair ask me? I am informed the gentleman reserves the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the regular order is demanded, the Chair must rule on the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman from Kansas desires to offer his amendment—

Mr. LITTLE. If I may be permitted—

Mr. FOSTER. I will withhold the demand for the regular order for five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. If I am not permitted to proceed, I shall make the point of order that it is new legislation, and the gentleman can do as he pleases.

Mr. FLOOD. All right; the gentleman can pursue his own course.

Mr. LITTLE. I shall pursue my own course. I am getting tired of this, for every time a new man endeavors to speak I find that anonymous points of order and rules are invoked against him and nobody else. I am going to do a little of that from now on. Now, this will read as follows if my amendment is carried:

To enable the President, in his discretion, and in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to make special allowances by way of additional compensation to consular and diplomatic officers and consular assistants and officers of the United States Court for China in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living—

And here is where we get in—

and the changes of the comparative values of American money and the money at the post to which they may be assigned, \$700,000.

The point I have in mind is Persia. The salary of the minister to Persia is \$10,000, paid in Persia. We are told it is paid in gold. That is the law, but it is never paid in gold. What happens is this, that he sits down and draws upon the United States for his salary, at intervals, probably on London, where the account is kept, or formerly was. Then he takes that paper, a draft, and he sells it to the bank. He does not get gold for it. If he got gold he could take it to the mint of Persia and have it minted and get his money.

Mr. FLOOD. What kind of money would he get?

Mr. LITTLE. If he got gold he would get gold money. He could have it minted into Persian money.

Mr. FLOOD. He would have Persian money?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes; Persian gold. He says there is a great deal of difference between the purchasing power of the Persian gold and silver money. He draws a bill of exchange and goes to the bank and sells it to the bank. The bank has no account in dollars. The bank puts it into Persian money and he sells it for whatever he can get. Before this war began the normal rate of exchange was such that he would get \$11,500 for \$10,000, and he would go out and buy with that money. Of course, at the

present time the values there have risen five times what they were before, and he can buy only one-fifth as much. It does not happen to the consul there for America; it does not happen to the missionaries there, or to anybody else there except this fellow, who happens to come from the district I represent. Now, here is what happens to him: When he takes his money down he finds the rate of exchange has changed, so that instead of getting \$11 for \$10 he gets \$5.50 for \$10. That is the rate of exchange now. In other words, instead of having \$10,000 in gold he would get \$5,500. Now, the purchasing power of that has diminished five times, and this man is actually getting a salary of \$1,000. To equalize, he must draw on us for the equivalent of \$10,000 in gold. Now, what I ask is this—it is no favor for him; I just ask that when the department figures out what he should have in relation to others by reason of the 500 per cent increase in the value of things there which he has to pay for, that they also take into consideration whatever they deem is wise in regard to fixing his rate of exchange, so that he will not lose everything he has got. The department is not opposed to this, as he thinks. He was getting along all right until it got down to the Fourth Auditor of the Treasury, and there they locked horns. He said this Persian minister would not only have to bear that expense himself but would have to pay back several thousand dollars.

Mr. FLOOD. How would he do that?

Mr. LITTLE. Because the Auditor of the Treasury says that he would. He has taken an appeal to the comptroller.

Mr. FLOOD. Where could he draw on the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. LITTLE. He drew on the Treasury.

Mr. FLOOD. For how much?

Mr. LITTLE. For \$2,500, I presume, from time to time.

Mr. FLOOD. A quarter?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes. The Auditor of the Treasury has checked it up and says that he is not entitled to draw the way he has been. The exchange is such that he is not entitled to do this. They want him to pay back something like \$6,000. He says:

Every other Government having legations or consulates here allows its minister, consul, and other officials full prewar exchange rates.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks for five minutes additional. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order. I do not like to shut anybody off, but—

Mr. LITTLE. I showed it to the Member and he said he would object to it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we ought to proceed. The gentleman has had five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I have had five minutes? Mr. Chairman, has my amendment been reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] insist on the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. With the understanding I had with the chairman of the committee, I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. LITTLE. I offer the amendment then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 22, line 8, after the word "living," insert "and the changes in the comparative values of American money and the money."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. The minister says:

My accounts are settled quarterly by the Bureau of Accounts at the State Department, and they seem to have regularly approved my accounts as rendered. But all accounts must pass muster at the auditor's office in the Treasury Department. It was there that sorrow met me. For two years I had no notice of any settlement of any accounts by the Auditor for the State Department, though I cabled and asked three different times without getting a definite answer, and quite naturally assumed I was correct and my accounts being approved. Imagine my surprise when I got a letter the other day showing that under a governing precedent I was only entitled to whatever \$10,000 would buy in the foreign currency, no matter how little that sum was.

It was 5,500 toman for \$10,000.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman how his amendment could cure the past if it were adopted? I can see how it could cure the future, but I can not see how it would reach back to the past.

Mr. LITTLE. I have taken that up with the comptroller. There has been an appeal made to him, and I am in hopes that he will be reasonable about it. I do not want to leave the affair open any more.

Mr. ROGERS. Does it not strike the gentleman that the language now in the bill and in this paragraph should be construed liberally enough to take care of the case which the gentleman mentioned?

Mr. LITTLE. I want to be sure it will be.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I understand now that this minister or consul who has been writing to the gentleman—

Mr. LITTLE. He says:

Moreover, during all this time, our consul here, in the same building, received his regular settlement of his accounts, which were made out just like mine exactly, and every account of his was approved.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am asking who he is.

Mr. LITTLE. He says:

Every account of his was approved. He had figured the kran as of a value of \$0.0875, the same as I had; but the same auditor, E. D. Hearne, approved his accounts thus, while in mine he fixes the kran value at over \$0.18.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Is this a missionary that is writing to the gentleman?

Mr. LITTLE. No; I can not yield to the gentleman any further.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am simply asking the gentleman to tell me by whom the letter was written.

Mr. LITTLE. The minister.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Now, I understand the gentleman's contention is that this American minister's position is, in spite of the law, that he shall draw sufficient money to cover his salary in that country, without regard to the amount of money that it takes. Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. LITTLE. Here is the gentleman's position: Here is \$700,000 given in order to adjust their official income to the ascertained cost of living. That is the law proposed here. That means that they will give them \$700,000. Now, while they are doing that, I ask that this man should have the same treatment that everybody else gets in every country and which our consul gets in that very town. I ask the man be paid \$10,000 in gold there or its equivalent in Persian money. You can send him the gold if you wish; if not, buy him enough toman to equal it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Under this law, is not this discretionary power lodged with the President to take care of the difference that arises by reason of the differences in the rates of exchange in the different countries as to the value of the money?

Mr. LITTLE. No; it is not. But I can not yield further. Here you undertake to give away \$700,000, and you leave it to the discretion of the President as to where it will be put. I ask you to leave it in the discretion of the President, which is the department, and I say to you there is a consul and a minister at Teheran, Persia, who are being treated in such a way that the consul gets his full salary and the minister does not get half of his. I ask that you apply the same rule to both of them, and to take into consideration the fact that every foreign minister there and every missionary and everybody who does business there, except this fellow from Kansas, gets his money; every man, he tells us. Now, what is the objection to the gentleman from Kansas getting his money?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. LITTLE. Why?

Mr. FLOOD. I will tell you if you will wait. I hope it will not be adopted because—

Mr. LITTLE. Because he is from Kansas? [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. Because the rate of exchange in these countries changes almost daily, and we would have to give the State Department a good deal of force to keep up with the fluctuations of exchange. The gentleman is occupying this position: At one time \$10,000 American money got him \$11,000 in Persian silver. He never returned that extra \$1,000 to this country. He put it in his pocket and kept it.

Mr. LITTLE. You might just as well say that he got 11 cows for the \$10. The 11 toman was the same as \$10. If he had bought 11 cows you would have him bring back a cow. [Laughter.]

Mr. FLOOD. Then why is not 5½ toman the same as \$10? He got \$1,000 more than his salary when he exchanged American warrants for Persian money. Over in China at one time a gold warrant for \$10,000 would bring the holder \$20,000. Now silver has gotten to be rated as relatively more valuable than gold.

Mr. LITTLE. He could not buy any more for \$20 silver than for \$10 in gold.

Mr. FLOOD. There are men who do not agree with the gentleman about that. They state they were caught coming and going. They said that the silver dollar then probably brought as much as now. If this amendment were adopted we would have to establish a bureau in the State Department to keep up with the fluctuations in exchange in these silver countries, and it does seem to me that we ought not to adopt an amendment of this kind, which inaugurates a new policy, until we know something about it more than we can gather from a letter from the beneficiary of this amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Are you afraid to trust the President?

Mr. FLOOD. No; I am not afraid to trust the President.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of order, and the Chair is of opinion that the point is well taken.

Mr. LITTLE. It was agreed, Mr. Chairman, before we began that this whole clause was not proper; that it was subject to a point of order. It was agreed that it was all subject to a point of order; that it was all new legislation. Now you say that my amendment is not germane. You may say that my amendment is new legislation; but to say that my amendment is not germane is pure nonsense. Your amendment is new legislation and mine is new legislation, and mine is germane, and the same point would apply there. And this fact is also observable there, that if the gentleman's amendment is new legislation and is in order, anybody will concede—even the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]—that I could offer an amendment slightly increasing the President's discretion.

Now, there is nothing to this point of order. If he is going to say that I am trying to offer new legislation, of course he has got me; but I do not think there is a parliamentarian in the House who cares to go on record on the proposition that this amendment is not germane. The provision of the bill is that the President can give away \$700,000 to make good to our representatives for the losses they sustain by reason of all these troublous days, and that is the provision of my amendment to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FLOOD: Page 22, line 5, after the word "allowances" insert: "during pendency of existing war and for six months after its termination."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. I withheld my point of order that this was new legislation on the promise that I should have a vote upon my amendment. I rise to make the parliamentary inquiry whether a gentleman in this House is going to make such an agreement, and make it impossible for me to make the point of order, and then refuse to have a vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no agreement whatsoever made with the gentleman from Kansas as to having the point of order withdrawn with the understanding that his amendment should be considered in order.

Mr. LITTLE. I had an understanding, as I understood it, with the chairman of this committee, that if I withheld my point of order that the paragraph in the bill was new legislation I should have a vote on my amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. I made no point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. That was my understanding of the agreement, and I think the record will show it.

Mr. FLOOD. There was no such agreement, but even if there was, I made no point of order.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman is forgetting. I think he or some one did make such an agreement in effect.

Mr. FLOOD. Even if the record did show it, I made no point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] insisting on a point of order in view of what I understood to be an agreement?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have been present during this whole proceeding, and if there was a public understanding on the floor of the House between the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Virginia—

Mr. FLOOD. There was not.

Mr. STAFFORD. That if the gentleman's point of order was withheld no point of order would be made against his amendment, I certainly would not press that point of order. Now, I call upon the record to show whether there was any such understanding. I will not be a party to the violation of any gentlemen's agreement, and if there is such I will not press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will indulge the Chair just a moment, the Chair can not be cognizant of private conversations.

Mr. LITTLE. There was none. Mr. Chairman, I will rise to a question of privilege in a minute, and we will take up a heap more time than we will in some other way. I said here on this floor that unless I was allowed to have a vote on my amendment I would make the point of order that this was new legislation, and I was allowed to proceed on that theory, the point being withdrawn.

Mr. FLOOD. Nobody acquiesced in that.

Mr. LITTLE. I had an understanding on the open floor, as I recall the conversation, and I think the gentleman will agree with me. I said unless I was allowed to have a vote on my amendment I would make the point of order that this was new legislation.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman certainly said that.

Mr. LITTLE. My understanding was that we agreed that we should go on with that understanding. The point of order against my amendment was withdrawn and I proceeded.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know what the gentleman's understanding was.

Mr. LITTLE. You said so, as I understood.

Mr. FLOOD. I never said a word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's statement, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the point of order which I made against the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw his point of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LITTLE) there were—ayes 10, noes 22.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 10, the noes are 22, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. LITTLE. Well, I feel better, anyhow. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Allowance for clerk hire at consulates; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of State, \$1,200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Here is an increase of \$400,000 in this item of \$1,200,000 for clerk hire at consulates. Will the chairman of the committee explain the reasons for such an unusual increase?

Mr. FLOOD. Twenty-five new consulates were provided, and there must be a clerk at \$2,000 at each one of these consulates. Then it is desired to have these economic assistants. The provision for economic assistants went out on a point of order, but the appropriation was not decreased, and they will be named as consuls. There must be a couple of clerks to assist each one of these men.

Mr. STAFFORD. What salary do you propose to pay these clerks?

Mr. FLOOD. Two thousand dollars. There are 25 at \$2,000, and then 150 vice consuls. The provision was to allow them clerks at \$1,000 apiece. I do not know that I am right about both clerks of consular assistants getting \$2,000. There are 25 new consuls and economic assistants and a couple of clerks to assist each one of these men. That would be 50 clerks, probably 25 at \$1,000 each and 25 at \$2,000 each.

Mr. STAFFORD. But that would not account for the \$400,000 increase.

Mr. FLOOD. There was \$175,000 in addition to that amount appropriated in the deficiency bill from the Committee on Appropriations. The real increase in the amount in this bill over the former appropriation was \$207,000, and out of this increase of \$207,000, with the old appropriation, the department planned to take care of the 225 additional clerks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES, UNITED STATES CONSULATES.

Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent (so much as may be necessary), repairs to consular buildings owned by the United States, postage, furniture, including typewriters and exchange of same, statistics, newspapers, freight (foreign and domestic), telegrams, advertising,

messenger service, traveling expenses of consular officers and consular assistants, and economic assistants, compensation of Chinese writers, loss by exchange, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the President may think necessary for the several consulates and consular agencies in the transaction of their business, and payment in advance of subscriptions for newspapers (foreign and domestic) under this appropriation is hereby authorized, \$1,168,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. Here again we have an increased appropriation of nearly \$300,000, but I rise not so much to call attention to the unusual increase as to ask the gentleman whether he has any objection to striking out the "economic assistants," in line 9, page 24?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "economic assistants."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase or erection, and the alteration, repair, and furnishing of embassy and legation buildings in the principal capitals of the world, and consular buildings at the principal ports in China, \$3,000,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby given authority to acquire, for the purposes specified, as soon as may advantageously be done, suitable buildings and to alter, repair, and furnish said buildings or acquire appropriate sites and to erect and furnish suitable buildings thereon, or to acquire options upon suitable buildings or appropriate sites, as may in his judgment be for the best interests of the Government: *Provided, however*, That not more than \$250,000 shall be expended at any one place, except that in cities containing 1,000,000 or more inhabitants the limit of cost shall be \$500,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the paragraph just read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the amendments to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FERRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14516) making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the year ending June 30, 1920, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

At the request of Mr. WELTY, indefinite leave of absence was granted to Mr. LEA of California on account of the sickness of his wife.

HOSPITAL AND SANITARY FACILITIES FOR DISABLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views (H. Rept. No. 879, pt. 2) on the bill (H. R. 13026) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to provide hospital and sanitary facilities for discharged sick and disabled soldiers and sailors.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the majority report been filed?

Mr. KREIDER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the two requests?

There was no objection.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920. Pending that motion, I desire to see if we can not come to some understanding as

to the time for general debate. Has the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER] any suggestions to make?

Mr. SNYDER. We would like an hour and a half on this side.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman could not make it an hour, so that we can get through with two hours?

Mr. SNYDER. How much time is the gentleman going to use over there?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. We will probably use an hour on this side if any is used at all. If none is asked, we would not have to use any on this side.

Mr. SNYDER. I am just as anxious as the gentleman to expedite legislation, but we shall require an hour and a half on this side.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be concluded in not to exceed three hours, one half of that time to be controlled by myself and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNYDER].

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion, the gentleman asks unanimous consent that general debate shall not proceed more than three hours, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from New York. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma, that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Indian appropriation bill, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York use some of his time now?

Mr. SNYDER. I have no one ready to proceed to-night.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14746) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10663. An act to convey a strip of land on the site of the Federal building at Princeton, Ind.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 23, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill relating to the pay of retired enlisted men serving as field clerks (H. Doc. 1716); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a detailed report of all receipts and expenditures of special contingent funds which the United States collects from nonmilitary residents and transportation companies at Fort Monroe, Va. (H. Doc. 1717); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3079) to fix the salaries of the clerks of the United States district courts and to provide for their office expenses, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 960), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIFFIN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13912) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept a correctionary deed for land of new post office at New York, N. Y., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 964), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4017) for the relief of Catherine Grace, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 961), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WELLING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14584) for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 962), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3536) for the relief of Jose Ramon Cordova, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 963), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHERWOOD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14894) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and to widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, which said bill is a substitute for sundry pension bills heretofore introduced, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 965), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 14852) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kendallville, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14853) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Haven, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14854) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of South Whitley, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14855) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Waterloo, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14856) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Butler, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14857) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Churubusco, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14858) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Garrett, Ind., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 14859) to give officers and enlisted men of the Russian Railway Service Corps the benefits of the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 14860) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Canton, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, cap-

tured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 14861) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kinsley, in the county of Edwards and State of Kansas, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14862) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dodge City, in the county of Ford and State of Kansas, two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 14863) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Sayre, Pa., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14864) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Troy, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14865) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Hawley, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14866) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Athens, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14867) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Hallstead, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14868) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Tunkhannock, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14869) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Honesdale, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14870) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Susquehanna, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14871) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Montrose, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14872) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Forest City, in the State of Pennsylvania, one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14873) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver to the village of Towanda, Pa., one cannon or fieldpiece, with carriage, captured in the war with Germany, together with a suitable number of shells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 14874) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish two condemned cannons to the Sixth Wisconsin Battery Association, of Lone Rock, Wis., for use at Lone Rock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 14875) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Sauk Center, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14876) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Paynesville, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14877) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Park Rapids, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14878) to donate two cannons of obsolete pattern to the village of Wadena, in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14879) to donate two captured cannons or guns to the village of Aitkin, Minn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14880) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Simpson, State of Kentucky, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 14881) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainfield, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14882) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Middletown, Conn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIEGEL: A bill (H. R. 14883) to promote the administration of military justice by amending existing laws regulating trial by courts-martial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 14884) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Canton, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14885) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Shreve, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14886) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Massillon, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14887) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Greenwood, Me., one captured German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 14888) to enlarge, extend, remodel, and modernize the post office and Federal building at Sterling, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 14889) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Northampton, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14890) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of South Hadley, Hampshire County, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 14891) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Cortland, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 14892) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 14893) for the relief of contractors and subcontractors for post offices and other buildings and work under the supervision of the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14894) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and to certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 14895) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Payne, Ala., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 512) authorizing the appointment of a committee to investigate the taking over by the Government of the wire systems of communication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring the passage of the woman-suffrage resolution; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring appropriation for the Owyhee irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon Congress the passage of legislation giving financial aid to soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, urging upon Congress the passage of legislation giving financial aid to soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, favoring the passage of the woman-suffrage resolution; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, favoring an appropriation for the Owyhee irrigation project; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 14896) granting a pension to Erastus A. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 14897) granting a pension to Nathan L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14898) granting an increase of pension to Fronie Fisher; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of North Dakota on January 11, 1919, urging the adoption of the Susan B. Anthony national suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of H. W. R. Strong, chairman of flood control and member of law and legislative bureau, Whittier Chamber of Commerce, relative to impounding the waters of Colorado River for irrigation purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

Also, memorial adopted by California Chapter of American Mining Congress in San Francisco, urging enactment of Senate bill 5234 and House bill 13497; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petition of National War-Service Committee of Retail Dry Goods and Department Stores, protesting against luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, demanding eight-hour day, increase in salary, reinstatement of men and women discharged for union affiliation, and thorough investigation of wire system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of District Council No. 24, Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, demanding eight-hour day, increase in salary commensurate with increased cost of living, and reinstatement of several hundred men and women discharged for union affiliation; also thorough investigation of wire system; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of furriers of Philadelphia, Pa., for relief from the tax on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Ohio State Board of Agriculture, favoring increase of compensation for employees in Bureau of Animal Industry and an increased appropriation for the work of the bureau; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Ohio State Postmasters' Association, in favor of parcel-post motor routes, as asked for by the department in appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of J. H. McGraw & Sons, Bellaire, Ohio, favoring continuance of Government control of the wire systems until further investigation can be made and additional legislation can be had for resuming private ownership; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Ervin Apell, Louis Helbrac, Jacob Leva, and George Leva, of East Liverpool, Ohio, asking for repeal of postal-zone rate bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of H. H. Sonneborn, president of West Virginia Clothiers' Association, protesting against luxury tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the traffic and transportation bureau of the Tacoma (Wash.) Commercial Club and Chamber of Commerce, indorsing Senate bill 5020, and petitioning Congress to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission certain powers taken away by the Federal control act approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution by superintendent of public instruction, Sacramento, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987, providing for a Department of Education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution by the California Chapter of the American Mining Congress, urging the passage of Senate bill 5234 and House bill 13497; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, resolution by the San Francisco Labor Council, requesting the Department of Agriculture to investigate the conditions existing in the Alaska fish-canning industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions by board of directors of the California Citrus League, urging that common carriers be released from Government control; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial adopted by citizens of Pueblo, Colo., for the recognition of Ireland at the peace conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Board of Trade of Lansdale, Pa., favoring the control and operation of the telegraph and telephone systems by the Government until Congress shall have studied the question and determined upon a proper and safe procedure to be thereafter followed; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 23, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, January 20, 1919.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	New	Spencer
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Swanson
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Thomas
Culberson	Kellogg	Penrose	Townsend
Cummins	King	Pittman	Trammell
Curtis	Kirby	Pollock	Underwood
Fletcher	Knox	Pollock	Wadsworth
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Sheppard	Walsh
Gay	McCumber	Sherman	Watson
Gerry	McKellar	Simmmons	Weeks
Gronna	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hale	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Henderson	Moses	Smith, Mich.	

Mr. GAY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL].

Mr. KIRBY. I announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], who is detained on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I announce the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING], who is detained in committee.

Mr. KING. I wish to announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MARTIN] are detained on official business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] is detained on official business and that the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] are detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. HITCHCOCK obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska to yield to me for just a moment? I have to attend a meeting of the Committee on Commerce, and I wish to put in the RECORD a couple of telegrams. They are in reference to a statement made by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] the other day in the discussion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Washington. A day or two ago, in the discussion of the pending bill, the Senator from California made a statement based upon a press report in reference to conditions in Seattle. This press report stated that there were soldiers and sailors who were being fed and cared for by the I. W. W., and that they engaged in a riot and demonstration, and so forth. I sent a telegram to the mayor of Seattle under date of January 22, reading as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1919.

OLE HANSON,
Mayor Seattle, Wash.:

Senator JOHNSON stated on floor of Senate yesterday that press dispatch said that after dispersing demonstration of I. W. W.'s at Seattle "it was found that among the outcast I. W. W.'s were soldiers and sailors of the United States, who were being fed by the I. W. W. and who were without resources of money or food." Is this correct? Kindly advise facts immediately.

W. L. JONES.

I have here a telegram from the mayor of Seattle, stating very definitely that this was not correct, that nothing of this